ΟΔΗΓΟΣ ΤΥΦΛΟΣ
THE
Blinde Guide, or the Doting Doctor.

Composed by way of Reply to a late tediously trifling Pamphlet, Entituled, *The Youngling Elder*, &c. written by *John Goodwin*, and containing little or nothing in it, but what plainly speaketh the Author thereof to lie under the double unhappinesse of Seducers,

To be { *Deceiving* And *Deceived.*

This reply indifferently serving for the future direction of the Seducer himselfe, and also of those his mis-led followers, who with him are turned enemies to the Word and grace of God.

The authority of which Word, and the efficacie of which grace are in this following Treatise, succinctly, yet satisfactorily vindicated from the deplorably weake, and erroneous Cavills of the said *John Goodwin* in his late Pamphlet.

By *William Jenkyn*, Minister of the Word of God at *Christ-Church* in LONDON.

---

2 Tim. 3. 13. *Evill men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived.*
Prov. 14. 16. *The foole rageth and is confident.*
Jude 13. *Raging waves of the sea foming out their owne shame.*

Nissen. de Trinitat. p. 8. Ἡ θεόπνευστος ἡμῖν διαιτήσατο γραφὴ καὶ παρ' οἷς ἂν εὑρεθῇ τὰ δόγματα συνῳδὰ τοῖς θειοῖς λόγοις, ἐπὶ τούτοις ἥξει πάντως τῆς ἀληθείας ἢ ψεῦφος.

Cal. Ep. 354. *Contra Mennonem. Hoc sane video, nihil hoc asino posse fingi superbius.*

Printed at *London* by *M. B.* for *Christopher Meridith*, and are to be sold at his Shop at the signe of the Crane in *Pauls* Church-yard.

ΟΔΗΓΟΣ ΤΥΦΛΟΥ ΣΟΦΙΑΣ

To the Christian READER.

READER:

WEre not my desire to serve thy Soul, greater than my hope to recover my Adversary, and were I not more apprehensive of the greatnesse of thy danger, than the goodnesse of his disposition, I should not spend my precious houres in a second engagement against his Errours; my contention is greater that thou shouldest not fall to be like him, than that he should rise to be unlike himselfe. He who wrote his last Pamphlet only to represent me unworthy to contend with

him, will hardly write his next to confesse that truth by me hath conquered *him. It's not consistent with his honour, who in his last boasted, that he had laid* the attempts of all his adversaries in the dust, *and that* Presbytery lay bleeding at the feet of his Writings, *in his next to lay himselfe in the dust, and to acknowledge that his Heresies lye bleeding at the foot of a* Yongling; *so that should he be convinced of the duty, (as possibly he may) he would be afraid of the* shame *of a* recantation. *Its more his sin than my unhappinesse (though both) that by confuting his errours I occasion him still to vent them; but never did I meet with wretched opinions so* wrathfully *asserted, and so* weakly *maintained. His Writings have more of* Tongue *than* matter, *and yet more of* Teeth *than either; with the weapon of the* Tooth *(like the* Hereticks *of old) he conquers, even after he is overcome with* Arguments.

Ep. to the Reader, *To. Eld. p. 3.*

Τοῖς δικαίοις ἡττᾶσθαι τοῖς δ' ὀδοῦσι νικᾶν. Nissen de Tri.

Certainly while Master Goodwin *wrote his late Booke he was under a quotidian fit of* Frenzie, *and all that time was an* interregnum *of his* reason, *his Pen being onely dipt in* passion. *His Pamphlet consists of such* unmanlike

manlike *ſcoldings, that he hath rendred himſelfe the* ſhame *of his* Party, *and the* ſcorne *of his* Oppoſites; *the only product of his reproaches, being a confirmation of the report of his being badly* nurtur'd *formerly, and worſe* natur'd *ſtill; Unhappy man! who* ſtumbleth *in the* darke, *and* ſtormeth *againſt the* light, *and who alwaies endureth that leaſt which he wanteth moſt. The weakneſſe of* Flatterers *hath ſo abus'd him into love of* himſelfe, *and the ſtrength of* intereſt *into the love of* Errour, *that he cannot abide either* plaine-dealing, *or* ſound doctrine. *The palpable weakneſſe of his late performance in his* Youngl. Eld. *extorted from him this acknowledgement, that he wrote not his Booke* to refute me, *and had not his Lordſhip ſilenced his Conſcience, it would have added,* but to revile me; *I confeſſe he words it more gently, telling me, that the* taske to which he was confin'd in his Writing, was to ſhew me more of my ſelfe (*nothing of* himſelfe) *and in purſuance of this* mercifull deſigne, *he puts his whole Booke under a* quaternion *of* topicks, 1. *My defect of* Conſcience. 2. *Of* Clerkſhip. 3. *Of* apprehenſion. 4. *Of* ingenuity (*forgetting in the meane time*

Ep. to Readers p. ult.

Yo. Eld. p. 1.

one little defect which runs through the veines of all his foure parts, viz. while he so rudely handles my *name, scarce to touch the matter of my* Booke) *unto which foure defects he reduceth whatsoever* malice *or* falshood *can invent against me; though the prosecution of them all be a continued transgression of the Lawes of* Art *and* honesty, *nay, not only of* method, *but even at once of common* modesty; *so that I know not in this world, the things that are so contemptible, as Master* Goodwins *scurrilities; for my part, I much more regard that excellent advice of* Basil, Neither be proud of thy praises, nor impatient at thy reproaches, when neither are due unto thee.

Μήτε πρὸς ἐπαίνους χαίνω θῆς τοῦ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀλήθειαν μήτε πρὸς ὑβρεις ἀγριάνους τὰς ἐκ ἀπτοιήσας σου.
Basil. *De ira.*

I confesse, I delight not to see *him in those distempers, for which I* pitty *him; I never intended to drive him into a* Frenzie, *and yet neither am I willing that he should drive me into a* Palsie; *idle* silence *is a sinne as well as idle* speaking: *his* Contumelies *can be no plea for my* Cowardise; *where sinne is* impudent, *reproofe must not* be bashfuil. *If* errours *seeke no* corners, *should* truth *doe so? How happy were we if we could leave all our stings in the sides of* Errour *and*

Pro-

Prophanesse! *if in their* blood *all our* hatreds *might be* dround! *I have ever thought, that* peace *with that with which we should* contend, *is the grand cause of* contention *with them with whom we should be at* peace. *Its just that they who will not* know Errour *so as to* hate *it, should not know* Truth *so as to* find it. *How incongruous is it to shun that man, upon whom (as thou thinkest) thou espyest a* Wart, *and to take him into thy bosome upon whom thou knowest there is a* Plague-sore? *Errours in Discipline doe but scratch the* face *of Religion; these in Doctrine stab it to the* heart. *When the whole* written Word *is at once struck off from being the ground of faith, and* whatever is in and about the Scriptures denyed to be the foundation of Religion, unlesse the Counsels contained in them. *When it shall be asserted,* that naturall men want no power of making themselves able to beleeve, *and that* notwithstanding all the power of converting grace, there's a liberty in the will to defeat and frustrate conversion; *In a word, when Sectaries strike at the* faith, *both* which *and* with which *we beleeve, its our duty (if ever) to* contend for this faith

To. Eld. p. 20. p. 47. p. 66

Jude ver. 3.

faith once delivered to the Saints; *In my present endeavours about which worke, if thou embracest what thou findest of God, I shall not only be willing that thou shouldst reject, and desirous that thou wouldst remit whatever thou findest of man, but shall also ever remaine thankfull to God, and Reader,*

From my Study at Christ-Church, London, *Nov.* 23. 1648.

A friend to thy Soule.
William Jenkyn.

The

THE Blinde-Guide GUIDED.

Chap. 1. *Directed more particularly to the reverend and learned ſubſcribers of the late teſtimony to the truth within the Province of London.*

Shewing the ſenſeleſſe raylings, the groſſe untruths, the ſhameleſſe boaſtings; expreſſed by Maſter Goodwin *in his Paſquill called,* The youngling Elder. *With a recitall of ſundry weake and erroneous paſſages contained therein.*

THe reproached in Mr. *Goodwins* Pamphlets, have more need to be *humble* under their *glory*, than to be *patient* under their *diſgrace*; no *ſcriblings* are ſo ſcurrilous, and no *ſcurrilities* are ſo honourable, as are thoſe which drop from his pen. 'Tis rare to meet with that Chriſtian, who doth not more than conjecture that there is much *worth* in every thing againſt which he expreſſeth much *wrath*. His *Antagoniſts* never could do him good *with* their wills, but he hath ever done them good

againſt his will. By writing againſt his *errours* they could never make him *better*, but he hath ever by rayling againſt *the truth* and them, made both to be better *beloved*. I ſuppoſe Maſter *Goodwin* rather *noteth* than *liketh* that abundant eſtimation which your teſtimony findeth with the *faithfull*. The *ſtones* that this *Shimei* hath caſt againſt it, God hath turned into *pearles*, and made of them a *Crown of honour* for it. Your *teſtimony* oppoſed *errour*, and God hath made it to vanquiſh *infamy*. He who directed you to make it *uſefull*, hath himſelf made it *accepted*.

God hath cauſed your teſtimony like the *ſun to riſe on the evill and on the good*, and rather than it ſhould not refreſh them that did *deſire* it, to diffuſe its beams on them that did not deſerve it. It hath ſhined upon the unſavoury *dunghill* as well as the pleaſant *garden*, the cloſe and noyſome *alley* as well as the ſweet and open *Country*. No wonder then if its ſucceſſe have been as various as its objects. When its welcome warmth viſited the *Countries*, how ſweetly fragrant was the ſavour which inſtantly they breathed forth? Who hath not gratefully reſented the pleaſant odours of *zeale* and *learning* ſcattered through the Kingdome by the Miniſters of ſundry Counties, in the many *atteſtations to, and approbations of your teſtimony*? Some of us have ſeene the letters of the *learned Spanhemius* highly approving of it, as an *eminent expreſſion of your faithfulneſſe to Chriſt and his truth*. And who obſerveth not the frequent and reſpectfull mention that the famous and faithfull *Generall Aſſembly of the Church of Scotland* maketh of your teſtimony, in their Declarations of moſt publique concernment. Theſe indeed were the *breathings* of the *more ſweet and open places*, when *warmed* with the *zeale* of your witneſſing to the truth. But who can expect the like from the *unſavoury dunghill*, or the *noyſom alley*, though joyntly enjoying the ſame bounty from the beams of *your teſtimony* with the other?

Warwickſhire, Eſſex, Norfolk, Devonſhire, Yorkſhire, Northamptonſhire, Lancaſhire, Wiltſhire, Somerſetſhire.

A Declaration and exhortation, *pag.* 34. The many teſtimonies which the truth and cauſe of Chriſt, the Covenant, and Presbyteriall Government, have lately received from that cloud of witneſſes of the Miniſtry in ſeverall Counties of *England*, after the example of the worthy Miniſtry of the City of *London*, againſt the errours of Independency, Anabaptiſme, &c. are unto us matter of great praiſe and hearty thankſgiving.

Thoſe *ſtinking exhalations*, thoſe *muddy ſtreames*, I meane the *ſuming*

fuming and *foolish* pamphlets arising against your testimony, out of that *alley* of errours, *where Master Goodwin* lodgeth, (whose composition is *mud and blood*) are a supersufficient testimony of the contrary. In his other impure pamphlets he outgoeth all his complices in wickednesse. But in his two last, wherein God did leave him to oppose *Christ* in your *testimony*, he hath even outgone himselfe. I know not one in the world left him to contend with for mastery in the black arts of *lying and reviling*, unlesse it be his *stygian teacher*. In which respect as his tearmes of *jouggling* and *novice* are notes of no disgrace to me, so neither is his *hoary and hereticall head* found in those *wayes of unrighteousnesse* an ensigne of over-abundant honour to him. 'Tis true, his expertnesse in lying speakes him *Captain of the Cretian Band*, and his skilfulnesse in reviling *a Doctor fit for the ducking-stoole*, though not for the chaire, but these preferments rather deserve pitty than provoke envy. As ambitious to give the world a view of his maturity in the forecited sins, he addresseth himself against the *reverend subscribers* of the late testimony in multitudes of passages, after such an odiously false and reproachfull manner, as thousands of morallized heathens in the world would blush if but desired to do the like. A handfull, in stead of a vast heap which might be given, are these which follow. To this effect he breathes out reproaches.

Master Jenkin his reverend and beloved brethren, are *these false-fingered men, these opprobria & propudia generis humani, The shames and blots of mans-kinde, the vilest of men: Their cages defiled, cleane birds forsake them, and it stands all of this nation in hand whom either the interest of honour or conscience toucheth, speedily to quit communion with them.* Epistle to the Reader, p. 4, 5.

In his former pamphlet *Syon Colledge was visited*, in this latter, 'tis *excommunicated*, in neither 'tis *prejudiced*. In casting upon you the names of *blots and spots of mankinde*, he is but your *scullion* to make your integrity shine the brighter by all these reproachfull smutchings; and as he willingly detracts from your *reputation*, so he unwillingly adds to your *reward*. What he relates of the *foule and forsaken cage*, clearely shewes that he accounts meetings for *prayer, preaching, purity of reformation, alms to the poore, reliefe to the aged, and for increase of brotherly love*, to

be the foule defilements of a place, of which the Miniſters having been guilty in their meetings at *Sion* Colledge, he knoweth that in ſtead of ſhunning *communion* with you, the faithfull with a holy ſcorn neglect his *excommunicating of you.* The truth is, moſt of thoſe whom he accounts to be of his own party, forſake and abhominate him if they have any thing of God in them; onely they being (I fear) under the tentation of *carnall policy*, have not (as yet) fully declared againſt him, for which the Lord pardon them. Maſter *Bridg*, lately of *Holland*, whoſe judgement in this particular I ſhall not mention without reſpect, ſaid but a little while ſince among ſundry Miniſters of my intimate acquaiutance, That ſome brethren of them were reſolved to repaire to Maſter *Goodwin* by way of adviſing him to deſiſt from maintaining his erroneous opinions touching the *Scriptures*; and if he refuſed ſo to do, they reſolved (he ſaid) to *quit communion with him*; with theſe or with words to this very purpoſe did he expreſſe himſelf. And I have heard ſundry of the Independent judgement ſpeake of this and his other opinions, propagated in the *alley* againſt grace, with the height of abhorrence, and with much profeſſed deteſtation. And the truth is, Maſter *Goodwin* in his pretended joyning with the conſcientious Independent, is lookt upon by the piouſly prudent but as a ſcabthat cleaveth to the body. He ſpeakes of *cleane birds* that forſake you. A double miſtake; I know but of one that hath forſaken you, and I wiſh he were not, Maſter *Goodwin*, in ſtead of a *cleane bird* an *unclean beaſt.*

He thus goeth on raving, *There's an old ſaw which cuts well:*

pag. 5. *Non audet ſtygius Pluto tentare quod audet*
Effrænis flamen ——— ——

Which he thus engliſheth:

The Prince himſelf of the black ſtygian lake
Dares not attempt what Prieſts will undertake.

In cutting with *this ſaw* he turned the *teeth* of it the wrong way, I mean from himſelf toward you, otherwiſe it would have cut better and quicker thus:

The ſins which ſtygian Pluto dreads
The Prieſt of Errour-alley ſpreads.

But

But let him turn the *teeth* of the saw his owne way, 'tis no disgrace for you to be taxed with deeds which *Satan* dares not attempt; and such are those which I mentioned even now to be the deeds of *Sion Colledge*; nor is it any honour for him to be in *harmony* with hell, and to conspire in the same performances with *Satan*.

He saith, *his saw cuts well*, but whom may he thank? he knowes who it was that did both *file the teeth of it*, and helpt him *to handle it*, viz. *the prince of flyx, in Satans saw-pit school'd he was*.

In another place, drunk with rage, he thus goeth on, *Impiety and opposition to the truth hang upon Sion Colledge, and if Sion Colledge were removed, impiety and opposition to the truth would soone fall to the ground.*] *Youngl. Elder, pag. 16.*

What? Si. Col. a prop of all impieties? could more be said for the removall of any lewes or stie of sin? 'Tis true, there's much impiety & opposition to the truth in the Kingdom, but, Mr *Godwin*, suppose impiety and opposition to the truth be *Independent*, how can they then hang on *Sion Colledge*? And were that poore Colledge so loaded with impiety, &c. a removall of it might be spared, for it would of it self certainly and suddenly fall to the ground. For his intimation of a *removall* of *Sion* Colledge, 'tis but a *cast* of his *Episcopall office*. Not long since he visited *Sion Colledge*, even now he *excommunicated it*, and now he sues out his Writ *de excommunicato capiendo*, absolving those from sinne that shall remove it; nay he makes it a most meritorious employment, even the *taking away of all impiety and opposition to the truth*. Mean while let him take *heed* lest he be *translated* from his *Bishoprick*, and removed to his *own place*, before *Sion Colledge* be removed out of its place: And truly could all his impious errours that so much oppose the truth be removed with him, his miserably mis-led flock would have a happy change, if his endeavours that they may have his spirit among them when he is gone have not been too effectuall, and his head be not their directory then, as it is their *rubrick* now. *Ar.* 1. 25.

He now foams for madnesse. *For all the successe, either in converting of soules, unlesse it be from God unto Satan; and so for building up of soules, unlesse it hath been in wrath against the Parliament.* *Youngl. Elder, pag. 25.*

ment, Army, and faithfull ſervants of God, which the Miniſters have had for theſe three or foure yeeres laſt paſt, I am full of rationall confidence, that it may be caſt up with a cypher, and meaſured with a reed that never grew.

In one thing you may obſerve Maſter *Goodwins modeſty*, he only ſaith, That for *theſe three or foure yeeres* you have converted none; but I have ſpoken with ſome very gracious Chriſtians, who have been exact obſervers of Maſter *Goodwins* Miniſtry, and they told me, That they never heard or perceived that *ever* God bleſſed it with the turning of *any one* ſinner toward God. How many he hath turn'd from God, its not ſo eaſie to determine as 'tis to fear.

But the *totall inſucceſſefulneſſe* of your Miniſtry in the converſion of none, is ſuch a putid calumny, that even *the ſectaries* read it with *bluſhing*, and when they are told of it, they turne their heads another way, and pretend 'tis for *conveniency of ſpitting*; It may be your grief you are ſucceſſefull in converting *no more*; your comfort you are ſucceſſefull in converting *ſome*; your confidence that he is *a ſoul perverter*, or at leaſt that the way to convert men, is not to teach *that men can convert themſelves*. His trouble it is, that any are converted by you from his errours. But if he thinkes that there is no converſion of ſoules in our Churches, what will he and his Collegues *do for new recruits?* their trade of *Sheep-ſtealing* will quite decay, for I have heard that ſundry of themſelves do not ſo much as pretend to preach *for converſion of ſoules*.

As for my ſelfe, I ſee no other import or tendency (as he *cants* it) in this his fooliſh pamphlet, but onely by reviling to vilifie me (though I can, bleſſed be God, ſay with *Joſeph*, *God hath meant it unto good for me*, yea, unto a *good contrary to the evill of reproaching*,) and therefore *more than one hundred times* doth he in this his rayling paſquill expreſſe himſelfe againſt me in ſuch termes as theſe: *Youngling, novice, boy, childe, youth, young ſpringlius, young glorioſo, young ignaro, young Phaeton, vaine young man, unworthy young man, young Jenkins, young ſimplicius, childling, young Pragmatico, ſhameleſſe young man, young Dictator, young Metropolitan, young Thraſo, green-head, young peece of preſumption, Prelaticall peece of Presbytery, unhallowed peece of Presbytery, ſwelling*

peece

peece of vanity, ſon of ſhame and folly, illiterate ſoule, poore man, ſilly brain, mancipium of illiterateneſſe, friend William, Batte mi fili, (as if with his religion and reaſon, he had alſo abjured *good manners.*) And he plainly tels his Reader, that *his aime in* writing his booke was thus: *To make me know my ſelfe*; though a gracious heart would have put him upon writing to have made the people know the truth.

Touching his reproaches for my want of yeers, I could ſay: That I was *ordained Presbyter* about *ten yeares* before Mr. *Goodwin commenced Independent*; That I learned thoſe rudiments of *Logick* above 20. *yeares* ago in the Univerſity of *Cambridge*, which Maſter *Goodwin* is now defective in, either by *never learning them*, *or forgetting them*, as is cleere by ſundry paſſages in his Booke which I have mentioned in this. That if I be ſo *young*, I am in part excuſed for *my illiterateneſſe*, my *times* (it ſeems) having been ſhort as well as my *attainments*. That I grant, Mr. *Goodwins book* ſpeaks *him old*, particularly, that paſſage of his, *p.* 2. *To. Eld.* where he ſpeaks his owne ſeniority thus: *The worſe ſpirits of malignity, hypocriſie, ſeardneſſe of conſcience, diſſimulation of the truth. &c. do not often finde men out till they be ſtricken in yeeres.* As for the reſidue of his Pamphlet it ſpeaks *him old even to dotage*, which is to be a *childe twice and alwayes.* That were I ſo young as he pretends, yet he cannot prove the *falſeneſſe of my aſſertions by the fewneſſe of my yeeres*, though this be the *ſtrongeſt argument in all* his booke againſt what I write, his only indeavour being to make my *booke a ſufferer by my yeeres*, becauſe he cannot make my *yeeres to ſuffer by my booke.* That were there ſo great a *diſparity* of yeeres between us; yet *truth is ſenior* to us both, and he and his errours are more *youngelings to truth* than I am to him, though I grant his *Errours* touching *grace*, *as old as Pelagius.*

Touching that other imputation of *illiterateneſſe*; I ſay I am ſo far from diſliking this his charge, that I ſhould have bin very well ſatisfied if ſundry who exceed Maſter *Goodwin* in *ſtanding*, and very much in *underſtanding*, had paſſed the ſame cenſure upon me that he hath done, and neves a nother. That as he hath not ſo much learning as to allow him to boaſt, ſo I have not ſo little as to ſuffer me to be unthankfull. That he hath diſhonoured

himſelf

himself in the *undertaking*, nay in the *overcomming* (were he victor) much more inbeing overcome by one *so illiterate*; having mustered such a vast body, such a huge book to pursue a flea, wherein every line is at least either a pike or a musket; should he *vanquish* it would be no *honour* to him, should he be *vanquisht* the *disgrace* would be indelible. That sundry, not contemptible, have had but low estimations of Mr. *Goodwins* literature. *Famous Doctor Stoughton* observing how Master *Goodwin* was wont to torture Scripture for the defending of his errors which in those dayes he vented in his Sermons, used this comparison in the hearing of an *eminent Minister* now in *London*, As an *hungry dog* that *teareth and gnaweth* upon a *dry bone*, and can suck nothing out of it for the relief of his appetite, by long *gnawing* upon it, wets it all over with the unclean moysture of his own mouth, and at length for hunger sucks in that moysture againe as if he had been beholding to the bone for it; so, said he, did Mr. *Goodwin teare* the holy Scriptures to draw out a sense that might countenance his unlearned and corrupt opinions, which he not able to obtaine, (the *Scriptures being dry to such intents*) the *spurious expositions* that flowed out of his owne mouth *upon the Scriptures* in his *tedious tozing* of them, he confidently sucks in againe, as if they had been the contributions of the Scriptures themselves. Mr. *C.* a Minister of good worth, now in *London*, and Minister of *Ma.* neare the br. whether upon observing the *darkenesse of Mr. Goodwins* way in *expounding*, or rather his *darkning in stead of expounding* Scripture, or otherwise, sometimes said, *Mr. Goodwin* was like a horse that went into a very clear streame, but coming forth againe, he left it by pawing with his feet, *very thick and muddy*. And indeed he is no better at the pen than in the pulpit; for in making all his pamphlets, he seems to *dip his pen*, or rather his *pia mater*, in *puddle-dock*. A reverend Commissioner, and a learned Minister of the Church of *Scotland*, having one of those wretched pamphlets called *Sion Colledge visited* sent him, in his letter shortly after returned, he used only this short but sharp expression concerning it, *Goodwin is a beast*. The passage I reade.

Touching that imputation of *Prelaticall peece of Presbytery*, I say, my principles, preaching, and other practises, are and ever

ever ſhall be, by Gods grace, oppoſite to *Prelacy*, becauſe my conſcience tels me that *Prelacy* ſo much oppoſeth the Word; under Prelacy I was an early ſufferer. At *Cambr.* long ſince I was forced to forſake my otherwiſe *dear Colledge*, becauſe I durſt not ſubmit to popiſh and prelaticall innovations, and to betake my ſelf to another Colledge in the ſame Univerſity, where I enjoyed liberty for ſtudy ſundry yeares without thoſe Prelaticall impoſitions; and ſundry are able to teſtifie how fierce the rage of the Prelaticall faction was againſt me a long time in the Univerſity, and afterwards; though I ſay not that Maſter *Goodwin* was connived at, and ſecretly encouraged to vent his opinions in *Coleman-ſtreet*, when the faithfull Miniſters of the City were ſilenced and perſecuted.

You have had a taſte of his reproaches; behold him now making *lyes his refuge*. He relates two ſtories concerning you, which together with his deſcants upon them, are the ſubject matter of moſt part of his *Epiſtle*; but there is ſcarce a word in either of them, in the writing whereof, his *fingers* were not *wofully troubled with the Cretian cramp*.

In his firſt ſtory he tels the Reader, That *although in a Provinciall meeting, it was reſolved upon the queſtion, That no anſwer ſhould be given to his booke called* Sion Colledge viſited, *and (he hopeth out of ſenſe of his innocency) that the graver judicatory had determined his immunity as Pilate did Chriſts, yet Maſter Jenkins like the Jewes, who would needs have Chriſt crucified, hath made long furrowes upon his back, &c.* *Pag.* 2,3. of his Epiſt.

A ſtory that hath not fewer than *foure or five* of the foreſaid *Cretian commodities* in it. For firſt, The *Provinciall meeting* never propounded, much leſſe made any reſolution upon, any queſtion concerning the anſwering or not anſwering his book. 2. Never was it reſolved in any of your meetings, that his book ſhould not be anſwered; indeed it was generally conceived that *ſo empty* a pamphlet deſerved not to be anſwered by any. So that 3. the forbearance to put any upon the imployment of anſwering his book, was not out of *ſenſe* of his *innocency*, but out of *apprehenſion of his impotency*; you looking upon him as ſeven fold more the *ſon of ſhame and folly* after the publiſhing of his *Sion Colledge viſited* than he ſhewed himſelf before. 4. Never

did *Mr. Jenkin make furrowes upon his back*, he onely ſhew'd the deep furrowes that *Mr. Goodwin* had made upon the back of truth with the *plow of his pen, Satan guiding and driving it moſt commonly for him.* And I know nothing that was laid upon his back but *a rod*, (according to *Salomons* advice) and that too of *his own making*. Sorry I am, that inſtead of making him to *mend*, it hath occaſioned him to be *mad*.

In his ſecond ſtory he tels his Reader, that the *Archytects of the deſigne* (he meanes of teſtifying againſt his errors) *obtained the ſubſcriptions of Maſter* John Downame *to a paper, wherein was not the leaſt mention of any of his Errors, and after Mr.* Downames *hand was obtained, they foyſted into the Catalogue of Errours what ſayings they pleaſed.*

Captain Cretenſis is upon his march, but I ſhall ſtop him. The relation conſiſteth of two as odious untruths as ever dropt from a *Cretians* quill. For

Firſt, I affirm, That *the Errours of Maſter Goodwin were mentioned and ſet downe in the Catalogue in that fulneſſe and order wherein they are now expreſſed, nay diſtinctly read in the hearing of Maſter* John Downame, *before he ſubſcribed his hand to the paper for the witneſſing againſt them.*

2. *No ſayings of Mr.* Goodwin, *or of any other of the Sectaries mentioned in the Catalogue, were put into the Catalogue of Errours after Maſter* Downames *hand was obtained.*

The former Maſter *Downame* hath acknowledged to two or three *Reverend Miniſters* that went to him on purpoſe for enquiry, at the ſame time expreſſing to them his abhorring of Mr. *Goodwins* opinions mentioned in the Catalogue; which I rather relate, becauſe he termes Mr. *Downame learned, and one of the beſt ſpirited men.* I like the expreſſions, with this note, that *ſuch men moſt deteſt Mr. Goodwins Errours.*

Two deteſtable lies are contained in that relation of his, *pag.* 78. *To. Eld.* where he ſaith, That not long ſince ſome of his followers *came to me to propound their ſcruples about the Doctrine that I had taught, concerning the nature of a true Church, and that contrary to my publique promiſe, I denyed conference with them, and that I refuſed to diſpute with them unleſſe by writing.* The truth is this, many Sectaries (obſerving how ſundry Chriſtians (I deſire to mention

mention it with humble thankfulnes) were ſtrengthened againſt the Schiſme of Independency, by the Sermons which I preached neer three yeeres ſince, concerning a true viſible Church) were filled and cut to the heart with madneſſe. At which time ſome of Mr. *Goodwins* followers, upon a Lords day toward evening came to my houſe, ſundry of my Chriſtian friends in my owne pariſh coming with them, to obſerve (as I conceive) their deportment. Where one or two of Mr. *Goodwins* followers that had a minde to ſpeak more than the reſt, diſcovered that ſhamefull ignorance in cavelling, that divers of thoſe that ſtood by, and ſome of their owne party, as afterward they confeſſed, bluſhed to hear them; my ſelf alſo wondring at their empty impudence; they being ſo farre from bringing any objection againſt what I had delivered, that they were not able without my prompting them to tell me what particular paſſage in my Sermon it was againſt which they took exception. Only they knew, that what I had delivered made againſt them, and they were reſolved that they would not like it. But ſo far was I from refuſing conference with them, that I entertained neare two houres diſcourſe with them at that time, though I had preached twice that Sabboth, my body being thereby very faint and weary; expreſſing alſo the greateſt forwardneſſe and willingneſſe to informe and ſatisfie them whenſoever they pleaſed, and deſiring them to that end to come to my houſe, for indeed I much pittied them. To be ſhort, it wat at length propounded by one of my friends, that my ſelf and two Miniſters might diſpute with three of theirs who were of a contrary judgement concerning the points in controverſie, for the ſatisfaction of the unſetled Gentlemen. This motion I embraced moſt willingly, and deſired them to certifie ſo much to their *Miniſters*, which they promiſed to do; and upon advice taken with ſome reverend brethren concerning the fitteſt and profitableſt manner of managing the ſaid diſputation, I made this offer under my hand in writing, and ſent it by ſome of the unſetled Gentlemen, *viz.* That I would ſend their Miniſters the heads of all my Sermons, with all thoſe poſitions contained in them, that oppoſed the way of ſeparation; and if they would ingage to anſwer them in print, I promiſed alſo to publiſh a reply in print

to that their anſwer, that ſo all the world might ſee on which ſide the truth lay. But this offer, ſavouring too much of plaine dealing, and love of the light, their Miniſters accepted not, pretending their mighty imployments. The Miniſters refuſing the diſcuſſion of the controverſie by way of writing, though ſolicited thereto by my Letter, what followed? why now my Gentlemen (to make up in ſobriety what they wanted in ſetledneſſe) having it ſeems leiſure enough, earneſtly deſire that I would engage with them in writing. This I refuſed, holding my ſelf cloſe to my former offers, that if any of them were unſatisfied, I would endeavour moſt willingly in a private way of conference to inform them, conceiving that this might content them who aimed at information and not at oſtentation. In this relation therefore of Mr. *Goodwins*, I charge him with theſe two broadfaced falſities: 1. His ſaying, That I refuſed conference with his followers, whereas I earneſtly invited them to come to me for that end. 2. His ſaying, That I was adviſed by my brethren to diſpute with his followers only by writing, whereas I never was adviſed or offered at all to diſpute with *them* by writing; my offer to diſpute by writing or printing, being onely made to their *Miniſters*, or thoſe ſo called.

In a coole requitall for theſe three rotten and falſe ſtories, in two of which he *baſely ſlanders* ſo many of his betters, I ſhall onely ſuccinctly ſhew how much more he hath abuſed himſelfe in his *Younql. Elder*, than he hath all or any of you, by his foule and falſe repreſentations.

For the wronging of his owne reputation, (if at leaſt it could be made worſe than it was before) by his late pamphlet called, *The Youngling Elder*, to ſay nothing here, how cheap and worthles he hath made his ſcriblings by the ſcores of pages ſpent in ſuch raylings, as the common obſervations and light of every reader doth confute (ſcum and ſcurrility making up his whole book.) I ſhall onely obſerve how ſhameleſſe and ridiculous he is in magnifying and extolling himſelf, pretending himſelf to be the moſt dreadfull adverſary that ever put on gowne or gantlet, *bragging*, and *ſwaggering*, and *boaſting*, and *ranting*, and *ruſling*, in the beginning of his book, as if he would

would bury ten ſuch younglings as my ſelf in one furrow of his brow; and as if he would affright the whole world into a forbearance of quetching againſt him, by the terror of my example; when as, alas, in the ſequell of his booke he is ſo wretchedly weake, and ridiculouſly empty, that inſtead of making me to *bleed with his force*, he onely makes me to *bluſh at his folly*.

Speaking concerning my hazardous adventures in dealing with him, he thus inſults: *Little doth this poore man know what he hath done. Presbytery lies bleeding at the foot of my writings, and is as good as broken in peeces by them; it is ſhaken, ſhattered, and diſmantled by them. When I write I feele the ſtrength of God neare me. I have had to do with the keeneſt ſons of high Presbytery, whoſe little finger had more weight than Maſter* Jenkins *loyns, and yet I have laid all their attempts and writing in the duſt, as well they did deſerve*, and therefore *this young man was of no deep reach, becauſe he feared not the ſame iſſue. Exempla gratia*, You laid Maſter *Walker* and Maſter *Robroughs* writings in the duſt; with the former of which you encountred as an *aſſe* with a *lyon*; and with the latter of which you never durſt enter the Liſts, though provoked by an *elaborate Treatiſe* in confutation of your errors about *juſtification*. So you laid Maſter *Edwards* his *Antapologia* in the duſt; a booke that ſo fully and clearly detected your frauds, that inſtead of anſwering the matter of it by *Scripture* or reaſon, you were faine to betake your ſelf to your *Grammer*, and only here and there ſnarle at the ſeeming improperneſſe of a word. He threatens, That before he and his *friend William part*, *he will make him as hereticall as himſelfe*, &c. And rather than he will not prove himſelf a *boaſter*, he makes himſelf a *ballad-maker*; he ſaith. or rather *ſaweth* thus, in the height of menacing:

pag. 3.
pag. 17.
pag. 5, Ep.
p. 26. T. El.

The time will come that youthfull Turnus *ſhall*
Wiſh dearly Pallas *neere had been encountred.*

But why rather makes he not uſe of the skill of a far better Poet, who brings in Maſter *Goodwins younger brother*, expreſſing himſelf thus to *David*:

——*Art thou weary of thy life ſo ſone,*
O fooliſh boy, phantaſticall baboon.

——— ——— ——— I will not file
My feared hands with blood ſo faintly vile,
Go ſeeke thy match, thou ſhalt not dye by me,
Thine honour ſhall not my diſhonour be,
No (ſilly lad) no, wert thou of the Gods,
I would not fight at ſo unknightly odds.

This, among the reſt of the characters of thoſe *ungodly men*, ſpoken of by *Paul* and *Peter*, agrees with him, *to be fierce and high minded*, to ſpeak *great ſwelling words of vanity*. He expreſſing himſelf more like a *Ruffian* than a *Miniſter*; he *ſhining* not like a ſweetly influentiall ſtar, but *flaſhing* like an angry bloody Comet, he ſpeaking after the rate of the eldeſt ſonne of *Gog-magog*; more like a *Polyphemus* than like a *Paul*; more like a *ſwaſh-buckler* than a *Biſhop*; a *Lamech* than a *Moſes*; and expreſſing more *the preſumption of Behemoth*, who *truſteth that he can draw up Jordan into his mouth*, than *the lamb-like ſpirit of a Saint*. In a word, he hath ſo much of the *Goodwin*, *that he hath nothing at all of the John in him*, for

2 Tim. 2. 3, 4.
2 Pet. 2. 18.
ὑπέρογκα μεγαλόφθογγος.
Job 40. 23.

——— ——— ——— From his eyes
All drunke with rage and blood, the lightning flyes
Out of his beaver like a boar he foams,
A helliſh fury in his boſome roams.

But alas this *Ivye-buſh of boaſting* doth but ſhew the badneſſe of *his wine* to all prudent paſſengers; his booke is a meer *thundring trifle*, a *mountaine of chaffe*, a *terriculament*, onely for the ignorant of the *alley*; like the *logg* in the fable, it makes a great noiſe in its falling, but then it lies ſtill for every *frog* to skip upon it.

The truth is, he might well have ſpared the paines of ſetting his name unto it, for ſo poor a weakling, and ſo miſhapen a monſter it is, that as none will challenge it for *theirs*, ſo none will doubt it for *his*; although in two regards it be very *unlike* the father, it having a rich and a *full head*, (a ſtuffed title) and a *thin empty body*, the reſidue of the booke.

He doth not ſo much as pretend to anſwer the greateſt part by far of what I bring in oppoſition to his errours. There's not ſo much as any mention in his *Youngling Elder* of the moſt materiall paſſages contained in mine; but he prudently paſſeth them

them by in learned ſilence, and onely here and there toucheth ſuperficially upon a few by-paſſages, (not but that he was able I trow, with the leaſt puffe to ſend them all on an errand to the wormes, had not his owne goodneſſe and noble nature more prevailed with him than any merit in ſuch a naughty youth as I) ſo that as to the buſineſſe of anſwering me, his booke is a meer *by-work*, and indeed among all judicious men a meer *by-word*; which he prudently foreſeeing, confeſſeth by way of anticipation, that his booke is not a *formall confutation of mine*, but that his end in ſetting of it forth, was to *make me know my ſelfe*; but of his childiſh and impotent omiſſions I ſhall (God willing) give a more particular account in the following Chapter. But if at any time he doth vonchſafe a mentioning of any of my paſſages againſt him; inſtead of an *anſwer* he either brings ſcoffs and reproaches, or elſe he labours to do the work of an *opponent*, bringing in ſtead of a ſolution of my arguments, a *bumble* of muſty reaſons, taken out of his other books to fill up paper in this; or elſe his poore few anſwers are ſo miſerably unſatisfactory, impertinent, and hereticall, that this his laſt worke appeares plainely to be the iſſue of his very *dotage* to all impartiall obſervers. Epiſtle to the Reader,

I ſhall onely in this firſt Chapter *barely recite* ſome of his anſwers to ſome places of Scripture and paſſages contained in my booke; reſerving the refutation of them to the third and fourth Chapters, though indeed the recitation of ſuch cheape and poore ſtuffe, be a ſufficient refutation of them among intelligent Readers.

The places of Scripture which I bring againſt his Errours, he either wholly paſſeth by, as if they had never been alledged by me, (and thus he dealeth with all thoſe many places which I alledge againſt his Errours about the Scripture) or elſe if he pretends to anſwer them, he puts ſuch falſe and unſound gloſſes upon them, that he ſpeakes himſelf moſt erroneous, even when he goeth about to cleere himſelfe from errour; like the ſwearer, that being reproved for his oathes, ſware with a greater oath that he did not ſwear.

To that place *Acts* 26.18. where *Paul* declares, *That he was ſent to the Gentiles to open their eyes, &c. I having ſaid, That* converſion

Y. El. p. 54. verſion is the *reſtoring of ſight, not of light onely*, he aſſerts moſt *prophanely and erronouſly*, that *mens eyes are onely opened in converſion as the light of the morning or the ſun may be ſaid to open a mans eyes which were ſhut by the darkneſſe of the night*; ſo that naturall men have good eyes, onely they are in the darke, there's nothing periſht in the faculty of ſeeing.

Yo. Eld. p. 55. To that place, Epiſt. 2. *dead in treſpaſſes and ſins.* he anſwers, by ſaying the meaning onely is, That they of whom the Apoſtle ſpeaks, were *guilty of death, and liable to condemnation.*

Yo. Eld. p. 87. The meaning of that place, 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. *The naturall man receiveth not the things of the ſpirit of God, neither can he know them, &c.* he gives us thus, *By the naturall man*, he ſaith, *is not meant the man that is ſimply or meerly naturall or unregenerate, but ſuch a kinde of men as are babes in Chriſt*; *and* whereas its ſaid, *he cannot know the things of the ſpirit of God*; this profound expoſiter of

Yo. Eld. p. 89. Scripture gives us this to be the meaning: *The naturall man whileſt he continues thus, hath not a power actually and for the preſent, to know ſimply the things of the ſpirit, but he hath ſuch principles which by a due and regular improvement may advance and riſe into ſuch a capacity or power as is contended for.*

Yo. Eld. p. 59. That place of 1 *Cor.* 4. 7. *Who maketh thee to differ*; he tels us, *is not to be underſtood of any difference betweene man and man which is made by any ſaving worke, but of ſuch a difference onely which ſtands in more or fewer, or in greater or leſſer gifts*; *which difference in the primitive times was frequent.*

He having ſaid, That no *writings, originals, or tranſlations, are the Word of God, the matter and ſubſtance of things* (*as that Chriſt is God, is Man*; *that he dyed, that he roſe from the dead, &c.*) conteyned in the books of the Old and New Teſtament, being by him acknowledged only for the Word of God. I demand of him thus. *Bu. p.* 22. how can any beleeve that *the matter and ſubſtance of the Scripture, as that Chriſt is God and Man, &c is the Word of God, when as he muſt be uncertaine whether the written word wherein that matter is conteyned is the Word of God or no*; This hereticall and rediculous ſoul fetcheth off himſelf thus, by asking me againe, *Cannot a man beleeve theſe matters conteyned in the Scripture, The Sun is the greater light, and the Moon the leſſer light, unleſſe he be certaine that the written word is the Word of God?*

To

To my charge, of his joyning hands with the *Arminians* in their errours, concerning *power to good supernaturall*, he answers not a sillable by way of denying the charge, but tels me, That in holding *Jesus Christ to be the holy one of God*, I joyn hands with the *Devill*. Yea, he saith the *Arminians attribute all the praise of conversion to God*. *To. Eld. p. 43. T. El. p. 44.*

Nay, he slights and neglects as much the accusation of agreement with *Pelagius* in his Errours, impudently affirming, that between *Augustine and Pelagius there was little or no difference*. *Youngl. Elder, pag. 52.*

To my allegations out of the *Fathers* and *Bucer*, for vindicating either of the Scriptures or the grace of God, he answereth not a word. And instead of doing so, when I bring multitudes of evident places out of them, to shew how those places which he wresteth ought to be understood, he very modestly rather than they shall not be thought to speak for him in some few places, tels us that they contradict themselves in all the rest.

To cite (saith he) *other words of a contrary import to those quoted by me out of the same Author, is no manifestation of the impertinency of my quotations; but it is indeed a discovering of the nakednesse of an Author, to present him contradictious to himselfe, and to expose the unstablenesse of his judgement to the eyes of men*; So that *Bucer, Ball, Augustine, Hierome*, are self-contradictors, unstable, naked, unable, rather than this petty-toes of a Pope can erre an haires breadth. *To. Eld. p. 5.*

He scoffs at the *absolute decree*, and saith, That *I and my mates tremble not to inform the creature against the Creator, as if from eternity he had shut up his grace, &c. with the iron barres of an* irrebersible indispensable decree. *To. Eld. p. 10.*

He tels us *pag.* 62. that ther's nothing but morall perswasion to act the will into a saving consent, for thus he wanders. *It passeth my understanding to conceive how the will should be wrought or acted into a consent in* any *kinde otherwise than by argument, motive and perswasion, unlesse it be by force, violence, and compulsion. The essentiall constitution and fabrick of the will exempt it from being drawne by any other meanes.* *To. Eld. p. 62. pag. 63.*

And page 65. he thus debaseth the working of Gods grace, *There is no man converted actually, but might possibly have acted, or demeaned himselfe so as never to have been thus converted.*

And pag. 52. *The adjutory of grace doth not imply a neceſſity of effecting that which is effected by it.*

Vid. p. 5. T. El. He clearly takes part with that infamous *Pelagius* againſt thoſe holy men, in charging them with *Manicheiſm*, I having told him, That the charge of *Manicheiſm* was an old calumny caſt upon the Fathers by *Pelagius*, he tels me again, *We are not to enquire by whom or upon whom it was caſt, but by whom it hath beene taken off from any of your judgement*; till this feat be done, he concludes *the charge muſt be continued.*

Youngl. Elder, pag. 45.

But of his omiſſions, and ſlender and erroneous performances, you may pleaſe more fully to take this following account in theſe three following Chapters.

CHAP. II.

Shewing Maſter Goodwin *his omiſſions in his* Youngling Elder, *and totall paſſing by of moſt of the materiall paſſages contained in my booke called,* The buſie Biſhop, *againſt his pamphlet called,* Sion Coll. viſited, *by way of parallel.*

Aſſerted in Sion Colledge viſited.	*Anſwered in buſie Biſhop.*	*Replyed in Yo. El.*
IT was never well with Chriſtian Religion, ſince the Miniſters of the Goſpell (ſo called by themſelves, and ſo *reputed* by the generality of men for want of knowing better) cunningly veſted that priviledge of the Church of being the *ground and pillar of truth* in	1. IS your ſorrow to ſee that they are ſo much as *reputed* Miniſters; your ſinne to ſay they are onely *reputed* Miniſters for want of mens knowing better. Tell me of one man, either Miniſter or private Chriſtian, differing from the Subſcribers onely in the point of Independency, who dares ſay thus with you. If you do account your ſelf a *Miniſter*, which way had you your *ordination?* whether by that way that	*Nothing.*

Asserted in Sion Colledge visited.	*Answered in Busie Bishop.*	*Replyed in To. E.*
themselves. There came lately out of the presse a few papers, stiling themselves, *A testimony to the truth, &c.* and pretending to a subscription by *the Minist. of Christ, &c.* Sion Coll. visited, pag. 1.	that the Ministers of *London* had theirs, who you say are no Ministers, &c. 2. You say, The Ministers have vested themselves *with* the priviledge of the Church, of being the *ground and pillar of truth.* — The Church (as a pillar) holds forth the truth, either in a *common* way to all Christians mutuall exhortations, profession, practice, &c. or in a *ministeriall* way, preaching, administration of Sacraments, &c. If you say the Ministers have vested themselves with the priviledge of being the *pillars of truth* the first way, 'tis ridiculously false, *profession* of the truth being common to *every one* in the Church: If you mean (as you must needs) that the Ministers have vested themselves with the priviledge of *pillars* in the second respect, 'tis odiously false, for the *Lord Jesus* himselfe and not themselves vested them with the priviledge of holding forth truth by way *of Office, Eph.* 4. 11. *Christ gave some Pastors and Teachers,* 1 *Cor.* 12. 38. *God hath set some in his Church, &c. Busie Bishop, pag.* 304.	Nothing
It is a *precious truth*	Though no *act* unto which man	

Asserted in Sion Colledge visited.	*Answered in Buſie Biſhop.*	*Replyed in Yo. El.*
of *Jeſus Chriſt*, That no act of man what ſoever is any foundation of *Chriſtian Religion*, the Apoſtle affirming that *other foundation can no man lay but Jeſus Chriſt*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11. and yet the denyall of the *act of man* to be a foundation of *Chriſti in Religion* (as viz. *The beleeving that the Scriptures are the Word of God*) is by the ſaid Booke called, *A Teſtimony to the truth*, ranked among infamous and pernicious errours. *Sion Colledge viſited, pag.* 3.	man is enabled by God (ſuch as *beleeving*) be a *foundation* in that ſenſe in which *Chriſt* is, upon whom we build the hope of our ſalvation, to be obtained by his mediation, yet beleeving of the Scripture, as it is an aſſenting to a maine and prime *credendum, viz.* That *the Scriptures are by divine inſpiration*, is a neceſſary *foundation* for other ſubſequent graces that are required in the *Chriſtian Religion*, and without which foundation all godlineſſe and Religion would in a ſhort time fall to the ground; no theologicall grace can be without faith; and no faith, if the authority of the Scriptures fall. If beleeving be no *foundation*, why doth the Apoſtle give to *faith* the name of foundation, *Heb.* 6. 1. *Not laying againe the foundation of repentance and of faith, &c. But, Biſh. p.* 9.	*Nothing.*
You cite ſome of my words barely, ſuppreſſing craftily my ſenſe. You cite theſe words: *Queſtionleſſe no writing whatſoever, whether tranſlations or originals, are the Word of*	Theſe words, *therefore queſtionleſſe no writings, &c.* are the concluſion and the reſult of your premiſſes in ſeverall long winded pages. If your concluſion be craſie and hereticall, your premiſſes muſt needs be ſo too; and therefore the ſetting them downe could not	

Aſſerted in Sion Colledge viſited.	*Anſwered in Baſſe Biſhop.*	*Replyed in Yo, El.*
God, Divine Author, pag. 18. without citing thoſe other words of mine, *Divine Author, pag.* 13. wherein I aſſert them to be of Divine Authority, *Si. Coll. viſited, p.* 11, 12.	not have helped you; and if the concluſion be not heretical, why do you not defend it againſt the accuſation of the Subſcribers, which you dare not do; but only ſend the Subſcribers to your premiſſes in the thirteenth page, leaving the poore 18. (the concluſion) to mercy.	*Nothing.*
	Suppoſe you had in the thirteenth page written the truth, therefore ought you not to be blamed for writing errours in the 18. *pag.* 21. *Bu. Buſh.*	
Let the thirteenth and fifteenth pages of *Divine Author* be look't upon, pag. 12. *Sion Coll. viſited.*	At your command I ſhall conſult the pages, wherein you would be thought to ſay, The Scriptures are the word of God. In theſe pages, and pa. 17, you ſay, That you *grant the matter and ſubſtance of the Scriptures, the gracious counſels of the Scriptures, to be the Word of God. As that Chriſt is God and man, that he dyed, that he roſe againe, &c.* Theſe you ſay are onely the word of God, and not *the writings or written word*; when you ſay the *matters, &c.* are the *Word of God*, you ſuppoſe they ſhould be *beleeved* for ſuch. But upon what ground ought I to *beleeve* them? I hope you wil not ſay, becauſe a province of *Lon-*	

Asserted in Sion Colledge visited.	*Answered in Busie Bishop.*	*Replyed in To. El.*
	don Ministers saith they are to be *beleeved*, nor barely because the *spirit* tels me they are to be *beleeved* for the *Word of God*, for the *spirit* sends me to the *written Word*, bids me by that to *try the spirits*, and tels me I must *beleeve* nothing to be from God, but what I finde *written*. I therefore desire to go to the *written Word*, as revealed by God, for the building my confidence upon the *matters* of the Scriptures (*as pardon through Christ, &c.*) but then *J. Goodwin* tels me, this *written Word* is not Gods Word. So it must be the word of *vaine man*, and so I have no more to shew for this precious truth, *Christ dyed for lost man*, than *mans word*. In your alledged pages you make no *distinction* between *res credenda* and *ratio credendi*, the *matter* to be beleeved, and the *ground* of beleeving that *matter*. The *matters* to be beleeved are the precious truths you speake of. The *ground* of beleeving them is the *Revelation of God in his written Word*. The *Revelation of God* hath alwayes been the *foundation* of faith; and now this Revelation is by writing, the ground of faith is, it *is*	*Nothing.*

Asserted in Sion Colledge visited.

Answered in Busie Bishop.

Replyed in To. El.

is written. What course tooke *Christ* and his *Apostles* to prove the *matters* and *doctrinall assertions* which they taught, but by the *written Word*, and when they would render them αξιόπιστα, fit for belief, they ever more tell how it is *written*. Consult with the places in the *Margin* and you *will* finde that the *matter*, *substance*, *precious counsell*, &c. contained in the Scripture, are proved to be things to bee *beleeved* becauſe they are *written*; yeeld your ſelf to that evident Scripture, Joh. 20. 21. *Theſe things are written* that *ye might beleeve that Jeſus is the Chriſt the Sonne of God*, &c. The *ratio* or *ground* of beleeving this precious truth, That *Chriſt is the Son of God*, is its *revelation by writing*. So *Act.* 14. 24. *Rom.* 15. 4. *Joh.* 5. 47. If therefore you deny (as you do in *terminis*) the *written Word* to be the word of God, what *formall object* hath faith? *i.e.* to whom or what will you ſend me for the building my confidence upon the matters and counſels of the Scripture, &c. Touching this I added in *Buſie Biſhop* the teſtimonies of *Tertullian*, *Ireneus*, *Aug. Chriſoſt.* &c. *Bu. Biſh. p.* 24.

Is

Nothing.

Asserted in Sion Colledge visited.

I beseech you brethren, where lyes the error of these words? If *God* should not endue men with such principles, abilities, &c. by the diligent improvement whereof they might come to be convinced of a readinesse, and willingnesse in him to receive them into grace and favour upon their repentance, and turning to him (upon which conviction that repentance and turning to God alwaies followes) they which are condemned would have their mouthes opened against *God*, and furnished with an excuse, &c.

The sum of his passage cited for an error in our testimonie is this: If God should deprive men of all power to beleeve, & yet per-

Answered in Busie Bishop.

Is not every man, as a man, a debtor to God, and a creature tyed to obedience? and doth his making himselfe insufficient to discharge the debt discharge him from payment? It would follow, that if such impotency excused from duty, and from the obligation of the the command, that those men were most excusable that were most sinfull, and had by long accustoming themselves to sin, made themselves most unable to leave and forsake sinne; nay, if by reason hereof God did not command obedience from them, it would follow, that such did not sinne at all; (for where there is no precept, there is no transgression) and so according to you, by a mans progresse in sin he should make himselfe cease to be sinfull. *Bus. Bish.* p. 29.

Replyed in Jo. E.

Nothing.

In your next, prove 1. That they who perish have power to beleeve. The Scripture denyeth it, when it saith, *The world cannot receive the Spirit, &c.* Joh. 14. 17.

2. Prove if a man hath not power

Asserted in Sion Colledge visited.

swade to beleeve, &c. God would be like a King that causeth a mans legs to be cut off, and yet urgeth him to run a Race with those that have limbs. *Div. Au.* p. 168.

Naturall men may doe such things as whereunto God hath by way of promise annexed grace and acceptation.

All the world, even those that have not the letter of the Gospell, have yet sufficient meanes granted them of beleeving these two, viz. *That God is*, and that he is *a rewarder of them that diligently seeke him*; which is all the faith that the Apo-

Answered in Busie Bishop.

power, that this impotency is meerely pœnall, as inflicted by God, so involuntarily indured by man (for that is the nature of a punishment properly so called) the Scripture saith, *Man hath found out many inventions*, Eccl. 7. &c. Gen. 6. 12. *All flesh hath corrupted its way, &c.* Bus. Bish. *p.* 31.

I suppose by your *naturall man*, who you say doth things to which God hath annexed *acceptation*, you meane the same man the Apostle speaks of, Rom. 8. 8. *The man in the flesh.* now, that man *cannot please God*, though your *naturall man* doth things *acceptable to God.* Invert not Gods and Natures order. First, *let the tree be good, and then the fruit.* Bus. Bish. *p.* 34.

What stuffe is here! have all the world sufficient meanes of beleeving these two, 1. That God is. 2. That he is a rewarder of them that diligently seeke him? *Pareus* informes you, that those two heads of *faith, that God is, and that God is a rewarder of them that diligently seeke him*, are not to be understood *Philosophically*, but *Theologically*; *that the eternall God is Father, Sonne, and Holy Ghost, and that he is a rewarder*

Replyed in Jo. El.

Nothing.

Asserted in Sion Colledge visited.

ſt'e makes neceſſary to bring a man into grace or favour with God.

They who have only the *heavens, the ſun, moone, and ſtarrs* to preach the Goſpell to them, have alſo reaſon ſufficient, to judge the ſame judgement with them who have the letter of the Goſpell, for they have the Goſpell, the ſubſtance and effect of it, the willingneſſe of God to be reconciled to the world, preached unto them by the *Apoſtles* afore-ſaid, the *ſun, moone, and ſtars*. Div. Auth. *p.* 183. *p.* 186

Answered in Buſie Biſhop.

of them that ſeeke him Evangelically by faith in Chriſt, with the benefits of the Goſpell, pardon, adoption, ſanctification, glory. And can heathens by the *ſun, moone, and ſtarres* do this? Can they by the light of nature beleeve *a trinity of perſons* in unity of eſſence. *None* (ſaith Gerrard) *can be led to the knowledge of God by the creatures, but only ſo farre forth as God is their cauſe. Now, God is their cauſe by a divine power common to the three perſons, therfore by the creatures we can onely attain to knowledge of thoſe things which are common to the three Perſons, and not to the knowledge of the diſtinction of Perſons*, Ger. de Trin. and can the heathens by the workes of creation have the diſcovery of a *Mediator*, and have Chriſt made knowne to them, and beleeve in him? I am ſure you nsver learned this of the Apoſtle, who ſaith; *that faith cometh by hearing*, Rom. 10. or are you of *Smalcius the Socinian his judgement*, who ſaith, that *faith in Chriſt* is not alwaies required *to juſtification*, but faith ſimply; and he proves it out of this very Scripture that you have alleadged, *Heb.* 11. 6. for the faith of heathens, &c. *Buſ. Biſh.* p. 36.

Replyed in To. El. Nothing.

The

Aſſerted in Sion Colledge viſited.

Nor were it a matter of much more difficulty to bring *antiquity* it ſelfe, and particularly thoſe very Authors who were the greateſt oppoſers of *Pelagius*, as *Hierom*, *Auguſt. Proſper*, &c. with mouthes wide open, in approbation of the ſame things for which I am arraigned at the tribunall of *Sion Col. Sion Col. Viſ.* p. 24.

Anſwered in Euſie Biſhop.

The Fathers aſſert the *being and nature* of free-will only, and not its *power to ſupernaturall* good in all the paſſages which you alleadge out of them. Though *Auſtin* and *Jerom* againſt the *Manichees* maintained the *nature* of free-will, yet 'tis as true that againſt the *Pelagians* they denyed the *abilities* of free-wil to good ſupernaturall. Of this latter you wiſely take no notice at all, as making directly againſt you, though there are hundreds of inſtances to that purpoſe to be found in them. And thus the learned, and orthodox Divines of the reformed Churches abroad, underſtand *Auſtin* and *Hierom*, when alleadged by *Papiſts and Arminians*, as writing for free-will. *Rivetus* and *Walleus*, two famouſly learned writers among the Proteſtants ſhall ſuffice for inſtances. *Baily* the Jeſuit, objected out of *Auſtin* to prove free-will, that very place againſt the Proteſtants, which you alleadge againſt the Miniſters. The words of *Auſtine* which both *Baily* and your ſelfe alleadge are theſe. *Si non eſt liberum arbitrium quomodo Deus judicat mundum? If there*

Replyed in Yo. El.

Nothing.

Asserted in Sion Colledge visited.

Answered in Buſte Biſhop.

Replyed in To. El.

be no free-will how doth God judge the world? This place *Rivet* underſtands onely of the *naturall being of free-will*, *For* ſaith he, *if man were turned into a ſtone, or a block, or a bruit creature, he ſhould be exempted from Gods Judgement, but ſince when he acts out of deliberation he chuſeth and willeth what pleaſeth him, he deſervedly gives account of his actions*, Riv. to. 2. p. 183. The place you alleadge out of *Jerom* is this. *Fruſtra Blaſphemas & ingeris, &c. Thou blaſphemeſt in vaine, buzzing in the eares of the ignorant that we condemne free-will*; And *Waleus*, T. 2. p. 95. anſwers *Corvinus* in theſe words of *Hierom. Fruſtra, &c.* but then he gives the reaſon why, and how both *he* and *Hierom* did allow of *free-will*, not in regard of its *abilities to good ſupernaturall*, *But becauſe* (ſaith *Waleus*) *He denyeth man to be created according to the Image of God, who denies him to be adorn'd with the naturall faculty of free-will.* Buſ. Biſh. p. 46.

Nothing.

Theſe men have exchanged the Fathers *adjutorium*, into their owne *compulſorium*. Sion Col. Viſ. p. 28.

In *Buſ. Biſh.* I ſet downe the agreement betweene the *Fathers* and the *Subſcribers*, concerning the doctrine of the *adjutory* of grace at large, and con-

Asserted in Sion Colledge visited.

The question between *Pelagius* and the *Fathers*, was not whether man had freedome of will in respect of good or evill, but whether men notwithstanding their freedome of will, did not still stand in need of the adjutory of grace, both for the performance of, and perseverance in what was good.

Answered in Busie Bishop.

concluded thus. I should gladly be informed by you in your next what the Ministers *adjutorium* differs from that held forth by the *Fathers*, and what they hold tending more toward a *compulsory* then these *Fathers* here, and in hundreds of other places have written, but he answers nothing.

Your mistake here *is pittifull*, for the great question between *Hierom*, *Augustine*, and *Pelagius*, was not whither the will did stand in need of the *adjutory* of grace for the performance of good, but what kinde of *adjutory* it was, of which the will did stand in need, and wherein grace was an adjutory; and I alleadge sundry places to prove that *Pelagius* himselfe granted *the necessity* of the adjutory, *but that* Austine *was not satisfied with that his grant, saying, that* Pelagius *is to be askt what grace he meaneth.*

Replyed in To. El

Nothing.

These are some of the heads of those many passages which Mr. *G.* toucheth not, whether because they were too considerable, or too contemptible himselfe best knowes.

Sundry other materiall omissions I could mention; and how unscholler-like a deportment is it for him to boast, that *Bucer* and the Fathers are of his opinion; and yet when the contrary is proved, by shewing that the scope and streyne of their writings oppose his dotage, and how they explaine themselves, to

have nothing to say, but that these Authors *contradict themselves*, and never to answer those multitudes of places which out of the said Authors are brought against him?

CHAP. III.

Shewing the weaknesse and erroneousnesse of his pretended answers to what I bring against his Errours about the holy Scripture.

IN your title page you say there are *two great questions* which in your booke are *satisfactorily* discussed:

The one concerning the *foundation of Christian Religion.*

The other concerning the *power of the naturall man to good supernaturall.*

The former whereof, you *discusse* after a fashion, from page the 26. to page the 38 of your *Younguing Elder*, concerning which your position was this: *Questionlesse no writing whatsoever, whether translations or originall, is the foundation of Christian Religion.*

Busie Bishop; *p*,23,24 *&c.* I have proved in *Busie Bishop* that this position doth raze and destroy the very *foundation* of Christian Religion, and the ground-work of faith; I still abide by what I there proved and maintained; I fear not at all to tell you, that this your assertion being imbraced, faith must needs be overthrowne: That the *matters* and precious *truths* laid downe in the Scriptures; as that *Christ is God and man*, That *he dyed for sinners*, &c. can never be beleeved with a *Divine faith*, unlesse the *ratio credendi* or ground of such beleeving be the revelation of God in *writing*, or the *written Word*. I againe inculcate, that your blasphemous position, *No writing, &c.* is contrary to Scripture, which tels us, the Church is built upon the *foundation of the Prophets and Apostles*, *Ephes.*2.20. that is, their writings, see *Chamier* who vindicateth this place against the exceptions of the Popish writers.

Chamier to 1. *L.* 6, *c.* 8.

Your position directly opposeth that place, *Joh.*20.31. These things

things are *written* that *ye might beleeve that Jesus is the Christ, the Sonne of God, and that beleeving ye might have life through his Name,* and that other, 1 Joh 5.13. *These things have I written unto you, &c. that ye might beleeve on the Name of the Son of God*; with multitudes of other places which have been, and might againe be mentioned, in all which the *ground* and *foundation* of our beleeving the truths of salvation, and consequently of religion, is said to be the *written Word.*

Deut. 17. 18. 19. Esa. 8. 20. Joh. 5. 39. 2 Pet. 1. 19. Luk. 24. 25, 27, 46. Act. 13. 33. Act. 17. 11. Rom. 14. 11. &c.

Nor did I ever meet with any one Orthodox Writer, but he oppugned this your abominable assertion, when he discourseth concerning the Scriptures in this point. I quoted sundry places out of the Fathers in my last, fully to that purpose, out of *Tertullian, Irenæus, Augustine, Hierome.* I might adde, that all our moderne Protestant Writers oppose you herein.

To name all would require a volume. *Zanchy.* Tom. 8. in Confess. cals the Scriptures, *The foundation of all Christian Religion.* The *Leyden*-professors assert the Scriptures to be *principium & fundamentum omnium Christianorum dogmatum, &c. Gomarus* also, *Thes. de scriptura,* may be seen to this purpose. And I desire the Reader to consider, That in this whole discourse, though you exceed your selfe in impudence and audacious assertions, yet you do not so much as offer a justification of this *Thesis*, as it is set downe in the testimony and in *terminis* taken out of your booke by the *London Ministers*, and therefore whatever you say might be neglected as not appertaining to this controversie between you and me.

Synops. pur. theol. disp. 2. Amesius medul. c. scrip. Tilen syntag. disp. de scrip. Rivetus Disp. 1. de scrip.

But to consider of what you say, though your whole discourse be nothing to the purpose, in this satisfactory discussion (as you vainly and falsely terme it) of the *foundation of Christian Religion.*

You do these three things: 1. You bring some six weak and childish exceptions against me, for opposing your errour in such a manner as I have expresst in my book. 2. You present the Reader with eight *terrible things* which you call *demonstrations* to prove that the Scriptures are not the *foundation of Christian Religion.* Not one of which eight feathers but is able to cut off the arm of an adversary. 3. You subjoyne two or three cavils (prophane trifles) by way of answer to me.

First

To. Eld. p. 27. First for your exceptions:

1. You say, *This unhallowed peece of Presbytery wholly concealeth and suppresseth my distinction, and what I deny onely in such and such a sense, he represenieth as absolutely simply, and in every sense denyed by me. In a due and regular sense I affirme and avouch the Scriptures to be the foundation of Christian Religion. I appeale to these words in page 13. of my Treatise concerning the Scriptures. If by Scriptures be meant the matter or substance of things contained and held forth in the books of the old and new Testament, I believe them to be of Divine Authority, &c.*

Answ. Rev. 22. 15. 1 Friend, remember you the Catalogue of the excluded out of the new *Jerusalem?* is not he *that loveth and maketh a lye* mentioned? wretched creature, what will be your portion if God in mercy give you not repentance? Doth not he whom you call the *unhallowed peece of Presbytery* set downe. page 20. of *Busie Bishop*, this your distinction? are not these very words spoken to and of you? *You grant the matter and substance of the Scripture, the gracious counsels to be the Word of God, as that Christ is God and man, That he dyed, That he rose againe, &c.* And page 22. *Busie Bishop*, reade you not thus in expresse tearmes? *You tell me p. 13. That you believe the precious Counsels, matter and substance of the Scriptures to be of Divine Authority, and in the same page you say, That the matters of the Scriptures represented in translations are the Word of God.* Do not you acknowledge, page the 39 of *Youngling Elder*, that I did set downe this your distinction, where you bring me in enquiring of you, *How can any beleeve the matter and substance of the Scripture to be the Word of God, when he must be uncertaine whether the written Word or Scriptures wherein the matter is contained, are the Word of God, or no?* Is it possible to dispute against that which is altogether concealed, and acknowledge you not that I dispute against it.

2 What great matter is it that you assert concerning the Scripture, in saying, You grant *the matter and substance* of the Scriptures to be the Word of God? All this you may say, and yet deny them the *foundation of Christian Religion*, and *the formall object of faith*. The Papists (from whom you have stollen most of your following Arguments) acknowledge as much, and yet deny them the *foundation of faith?*

3 You

3 You ſay you beleeve the *matters of the* Scriptures to be the Word of God, but you tell me not why: Nay you plainly *deny* that which indeed is the *true ground* of beleeving the *matter* of the Word of God, namely, *the written Word*. You are not too old to learne from a Youngling; take this therefore for a truth. Upon *what ground ſoever* you beleeve the *ſubſtance and matters* contained in the Scriptures for the Word of God, if that faith be not *ultimately* reſolved into the *written Word* or *the revelation of God in writing*, tis no divine faith.

4. In this your penurious and ſcanty conceſſion that the *matters* contained in the Scriptures are only the Word of God; you come far ſhort of the Scripture which cals the *Written Word of God* the Scriptures or Word of God: It telling us, That *all Scripture is of divine inſpiration*, and that we have *A more ſure word of prophecy*, not in regard of the *matters* of it, but in regard of its manner of manifeſtation *by writing*. And *holy men ſpake being moved of the holy Ghoſt*. Did the holy men ſpeak *what* they were moved to ſpeak, and not alſo *as* they were moved. Learned *Whitaker* tels you, The Scriptures did not proceed from God *tantum ratione dogmatum*, onely in regard of thoſe divine truths contained in them, but the whole *ſtructure* and *compoſure* of the Scripture is alſo divine, and the truths are not onely divine, but there is not a word in them which is not divine.

πᾶσα γραφὴ 2 *Tim.* 3. 16. 2 *Pet.* 1. 19, 20, 21. βεβαιότερον λόγον προφητικὸν γραφῆς. *Whitak. de Auth. Scrip. lib.* 1. *cap.* 10. *ſect.* 8. *Neq; tantum ratione dogmatum ſcriptura à Deo prodiit, etſi edita ſcriptura eſt ut certa & perpetua dogmatum ratio conſtaret, ſed tota ſcripturarum ſtructura & compoſitio divina eſt, neq; non modo dogma ſed ne verbum in Scripturis ullum niſi divinum eſt, &c.* *Yo. Eld. p.* 5.

To that ridiculous paſſage of yours in this firſt Exception, pag. 27. *Mr. Jenkins charge againſt me, in denying the Scriptures to be the foundation of Chriſtian Religion, ſtands upon the credit or baſe of ſuch an argumentation as this, &c. A wooden horſe for unruly Souldiers is no living creature*; thereiore an horſe ſimply Is no living creature; *ſo, The Scriptures in regard of the writing are not the foundation of Religion, therefore in no ſence are they ſuch.*

The anſwer is obvious; my charging of you to deny the Scriptures to be the foundation, &c. is not grounded upon any argumentation of *my* framing, but upon the reſult of *your own* arguments, as your ſelf have ſet it downe in the place quoted *Div. Auth. p.* 18. *Queſtionleſſe no writings whatſoever are the foundation of Chriſtian Religion*; which baſe being laid, the ſuperſtructure will be this, the Scriptures taken in your ſenſe, are not the

foundation of Christian Religion, you being no way able to ground your faith upon any *matters* in the Scripture; and your talking of a wooden horse shewes you have of late been either among the unruly Souldiers, or the wanton Children.

6 Why use you these words in this your last exception, p. 27 *the Holy Ghost saith*, Genes. 6. 6. *It repented the Lord, &c, yea, and God himselfe said thus to Samuel; It repenteth me, &c.* surely there is some mistery in it.

Yo. Eld. p. 28. Your second exception against me is, that *in as much as I can produce but one place wherein you seeme to deny the Scriptures to be of divine authority, or the foundation of Religion, whereas in twenty and ten places (you say) you clearly assert them for such, I ought to regulate the sence of that one place by the constant tennor of the rest of the treatise.*

Answ. 1 The whole designe of your wordy worke, called *Div. Au. of Scrip.* so farre as it handles this point was to justifie those passages in your *Hagiomastix*, which deny the *divine authority* of Scripture; in it therefore certainly may be found more than one place wherein you do more than seeme to deny the same.

Div. Auth. of the Scriptures, p. 10. you say, *No translation whatsoever, nor any either written or printed Copies whatsoever are the Word of God.*

Div. Auth. p. 12. *They who have the greatest insight into the originall Languages, yea who beleeve the Scripture to salvation, cannot upon any sufficient ground beleeve any originall Copy whatsoever under heaven, whether Hebrew or Greek, to be the Word of God.*

And Yo. Eld. p. 29. *When I deny the Scriptures to be the Word of God, I meane* whatever *is found in them, or appertaining to them, besides the matters, gracious counsells conteyned in them, &c.* And how can it be otherwise, when the places and passages in *Hagiom*, which you intend to justifie in *Div. Auth.* and *Yo. Eld.* are such as these. In your Hagiom. p. 35. Sect. 27. *Taking the word Scriptures for all the bookes of the Old and New Testament* divisim *and* conjunctim, *as they are now received and acknowledged among us (which is the only sence the ordinance can beare) they can finde no manifest Word of God whereunto this (That the Scriptures are not the Word of God) is contrary.*

And Hagiom. p. 37. Sect. 28. *It is no foundation of Christian*

Religion

Religion to beleeve that the Engliſh Scriptures, or that book, or that volume of books called the Bible, tranſlated out of the originall Hebrew and Greek copies into the Engliſh Tongue, are the Word of God, &c.

2 Inſtance in one place in all your writings, wherein you ſay as *unlimitedly and peremptorily*, that the Scriptures are the Word of God as you do here deny them; and you may have ſome pretence for this charge. Nay, it is impoſſible for you to grant the Scriptures to be the Word of God and not to contradict your ſelfe; you denying the *written* Word.

Your third exception is this; you ſay, That *though you do not beleeve that any originall, exemplar, or Copy of the Scriptures now extant among us is ſo purely the Word of God, but that it may very poſſibly have a mixture of the word of man in it, yet you aſſert them to containe the foundation of Religion.* i. e. *Thoſe gracious Counſells, &c.*! Third exception *To. Eld.* p. 28.

Anſw.

1 Your granting that the holy Scriptures containe the foundation of Religion in them, is but a ſlender conceſſion; I ſuppoſe you will not deny this to the books of many a godly writer.

2 In granting me that the *foundation of Religion*, *i.e.* the Gracious *Counſells* of God are contained in the Scriptures, and yet in denying that the *written Word* is that *formall object* of my faith, or that foundation for which I ſhould build my faith upon thoſe counſells of God for ſalvation, you do both delude your Reader, and contradict your ſelfe; you taking away what you grant. Gods revelation of his minde in *the written Word* being the reaſon why I embrace the Counſells, or *matters* as the foundation upon which I build.

3 You vainly applaud your ſelfe, for aſſerting the Scriptures to containe the *foundation*, when as you deny the purity of the Scriptures, for let it be once granted that *errors* are crept into the Scriptures, and that there is no *originall* pure (which is the blaſphemous calumny caſt upon the Scriptures by the Papiſts the *authority* of Scriptures falls to the ground, and we may call the whole Scriptures into queſtion. You aſſert that the pureſt originall exemplar is corrupted, and you know not what the particular places are that are corrupt; when any Sen- *Leo Caſtrius Gordonius, &c.*

tence therefore out of Scripture is brought againſt your errors, why may you not ſhield your ſelfe with this *defense, for ought I know the place whence you take this ſentence is corrupted, Ecce fundamentum religionis Goodwiniana*, behold the foundation of a *goodly* religion. I confeſſe one ſo *erroneous* as your ſelfe cannot coveniently be without this *comfortable refuge*. If you be not too old to learne of the Fathers, take this from *Auguſtine* in his 19. Epiſt. written to *Hierom*. *I ſuppoſe thou art not willing that men ſhould read thy books as they would read the Writings of the Prophets and Apoſtles, it being a moſt hainous ſinne to doubt of the freeneſſe of their writings from all error.* And the ſame Father in the ſame Epiſtle tells *Hierom*, that the *Manichees contended that ſundry places of Scripture which overthrew their errors were falſe, which falſeneſſe they did not attribute to the Apoſtles that wrote them, but to certaine corrupters I know not whom.* quod quia, &c. *which becauſe they could not prove, being overcome by knowne truth, they departed confounded.*

Aug Ep. 19 Ad. Hieron. *Non te arbitror ſic legi tuos libros velle tanquam Prophetarum, vel Apoſtolorum: de quorum Scriptis quod omni careant errore dubitare nefarium eſt. Manichæi plurima divinum Scripturarum loca quibus eorum, nefarius error convincitur quia in alium ſenſum detorquere non poſſunt falſa eſſe contendunt quod tamen quia nec, probare potuerunt, notiſſimâ veritate ſuperati, confuſiq; diſcedunt. Id. Ib.*

Exception 4. Yo. Eld. p. 29 For your fourth frivolous exception, you cite a paſſage out of your *Div. Auth. of Scrip.* p. 17. where you ſay, *The true and proper foundation of Religion is not Inke and Paper, nor any book or books, nor any writing or writings whatſoever, &c.* Hereupon you make a double enquiry. *Firſt, Why did not Mr.* Jenkin *inſert the words (true and proper) into the charge of my denial of the Scriptures for the foundation of Chriſtian Religion. Secondly, why doth he not declare that I meane by the Scriptures Inke and Paper, &c.*

Anſw. 1 Poore ſhifter! I added not the words (*true and proper*) becauſe the Miniſters tooke not your charge out of the 17. pag. where you ſay the words (*true and proper*) are, but out of the 18. where I ſay they are not. 2 Becauſe you being taxed with this abhominable error in the *Teſtimony* of the *London Miniſters*, your ſelfe in your Pamphlet call'd (*Sion Col. Viſ*) p. 12. for vindication and explanation of your ſelfe in this point, referre the Reader only to *the* 13. *and* 15. *pages*, and this 17 *page*, your ſelfe never mentioned in *Sion Col. Viſited*; to which book only mine was an anſwer, and not to *Div. Auth.* where (ſay you)

in

in p. 17. you mention *true and proper*; it ſeemes the novice hath now driven you to another ſhift, another leafe, though a meere *Figg-leafe* defence; for

3 Your deniall of the Scripture to be the *foundation* without this *mitigation* or allay of (*true and proper*) is moſt ſutable to your former undertakings. I tooke you according to the conſtant *ſtreine* of your writings, as you deſired even now; ſee *Hagiom. Sect.* 27, 28. as alſo the many places in *Div. Aut.* p. 10, 11, 12. and p. 39. in *To. Eld.* ſo that evident it is that theſe words (*true and proper*) were inſerted here, as *a blinde for your blaſphemy*. They are not found (for ought I know) in any other place in all your *Div. Aut.* you mention (I am ſure) no other place; nor did you in *Hagiom.* printed before your *Div. Auth.* once make mention of them. In what a pittifull condition then are the poore *old Hag.* to lye under the charge of ſo many tongues and hearts, ſo long before *Div. Auth.* was printed; to be upon *duty* ſo long before *releeved* with (*true and proper*)

4 Do you not leave theſe words (*true and proper*) out, in the concluſion of that diſcourſe wherein they are contained, in which *concluſion* being the *reſult* and *winding up* of all that which went before, you *peremptorily and unlimitedly* deny *any writing whatſoever to be any foundation at all of Chriſtian Religion*, without a (*true and proper*) to mend the matter.

2 Your ſecond enquiry; *Why doth he not declare, that I meane by the Scriptures Inke and Paper*, is too ridiculous for a *novice* to read, though not for a *dotard* to write.

1. In your next I pray tell me who beſide your ſelfe and the blaſphemous Papiſts, did ever by the Scripture underſtand *inke and paper?* Indeed *Doctor Humfred. Jeſuitiſe, p. 2. pag.* 89. Tels us of a Nun that to the queſtion, *Quâ in re ſita eſt religio Chriſtiana*, wherein ſtands Chriſtian Religion? made anſwer; In *lacerii panniculis*, in *torne rags*, We need no other *Oedipus* to open this riddle than Maſter *Goodwin.*

2 Had you therefore onely thus *trifled* by this denyall of *inke and paper* to be the *foundation of Chriſtian Religion*, you had neither been charged for erroneous by the *London Miniſters* nor any one elſe in this point; but when to your *trifling* you adde

blaſphemy, and ſay, That no *writing whether originals or tranſlations are the foundation of Chriſtian Religion*, and pag. 29. *To Eld. that you deny whatever is found in the Scriptures* beſides the precious counſels to be the foundation,&c. You are to be dealt with all upon a *new account*. You then go beyond your denyall of *ink and paper*.

Exception the fifth *To Eld. pag.* 29. Your fifth Exception againſt me is, That I want Logick, in denying the concluſion, without anſwering any thing to the premiſſes. You ſay, *you had proved the concluſion, That the Scriptures are not the foundation of Religion, with ſeverall arguments, and that without any anſwer given to any one of theſe arguments, I denyed onely your concluſion*, which was this, *No writing whatſoever, whether Originals or tranſlations, are the foundation of Chriſtian Religion.*

Anſw. 1. For that concluſion of yours, *No writing whatſoever is the foundation of Chriſtian Religion*. It was by the *Subſcribers* of the late *Teſtimony* taken out of your diſcourſe, without any mention of your *premiſſes*; your charge therefore of the *want of Logick*, is drawne up againſt them at the *feet* of many of whom, you may *ſit* to learne both *Logick* and *Theologie* alſo.

2. The *ſcope* of the Miniſters that ſubſcribed the Teſtimony was not to *diſpute errours*, but to *recite* them; and *recite* them they could not more properly than by ſetting downe the *concluſion and reſult* of your tedious diſcourſe, nothing ſpeaking a mans minde ſo plainly and peremptorily as *that*.

3. My booke was an anſwer to *Sion Coll. viſited*, and not to that former piece of yours, *Divine Author*: wherein you ſaid you brought the arguments to prove that the Scriptures were not the *foundation of Religion*. Had you recited your arguments in *Sion Colledge viſited*, they ſhould have been anſwered, though in truth neither you nor they deſerved it.

4. You bring one pittifull thing, which I dare ſay you account an argument in *Sion Coll. viſited, pag.* 2. to prove that the *Scriptures* are not the *foundation* of Chriſtian Religion, viz. *Becauſe Chriſt is the onely foundation*. Which weak cavill I fully anſwered, *pag.* 7. and 8. *Buſie Biſhop*. I call it a *cavill*, becauſe your ſelfe ſeem afraid to call it *an argument*; for though *it* be cleerly confuted yet you ſay I bring no anſwer *to any one argument*.

In

In your ſixth exception, you exceed your ſelfe in *ignorance and impudence*, wherein you write thus: *Doth not himſelf (Maſter Jenkin) diſtinguiſh, pag. 7. and affirm that in a ſenſe the Scriptures are not the foundation of Chriſtian Religion, elſe what is the engliſh of theſe his words, Chriſt is the one'ly foundation in point of mediation, and the Scriptures in point of manifeſtation, &c. hath the man a muſhrome inſtead of caput humanum upon his ſhoulders, to quarrell with me for denying in a ſenſe the Scriptures to be the foundation of Religion, and yet to deny as much himſelfe; Did I ever, or do I any where deny them to be ſuch a foundation in reſpect of repreſentation and diſcovery, &c.* Exception the ſixth, *To. Eld. p. 30.*

Dote you, Sir? or dream you? or are you ambitious to be Biſhop of *Bethlehem*, at your tranſlation from *Swan-alley*? Firſt, you pretend that you approve the diſtinction, and that you are of my opinion, *Do you* (ſay you) *any where deny the Scriptures to be a foundation in reſpect of repreſentation?* Then you ſcorne and revile it, ſaying, That the *foundation of manifeſtation* is an *abſurd* and a *ridiculous metaphor*; againe you owne it, and aſſert the Scriptures in this ſenſe, *The foundation, &c.* and laſtly you ſcorn it againe, and deſire me to tell you of one *Claſſicall Author* that uſeth it? Certainly if Maſter *Jenkin* have a muſhrome upon his ſhoulders, you have a windmill upon your pate. This paſſage (I fear) will confirme Maſter *Vicars* in his opinion of the ſuitableneſſe of the emblamaticall windmill, and make him applaud himſelfe notwithſtanding my endeavours to diſſwade the honeſt man from expreſſing you by ſuch a picture.

1 In this Exception, you aſk, *Did I ever deny the Scriptures to be a foundation in reſpect of manifeſtation?*

Yes, and do ſo ſtill, *Div. Author, page* 18. Thus you write, *Certaine it is there was a time when neither Originals nor tranſlations were the foundation of Religion, but ſomewhat beſide, therefore as certain it is, that neither are they the foundation of Religion at this day.* Thus you there, where you cleerly aſſert, that we muſt no more ground our faith upon the *manifeſtation* of the Scripture now, than they that never had any ſuch *manifeſtation* by way of writing at all. And what do you aſſert, page 49,50. &c. of that Treatiſe, but that Religion hath another *foundation* in point of *manifeſtation*, than the Scriptures, viz. *the ſun, moon, and ſtars, &c.* *Anſw.*

2. In

2. In this Exception you ſay, That *to call the Scriptures the foundation in point of manifeſtation is a ridiculous and abſurd metaphor: Maſter Jenkin thinks that he manifeſts the feebleneſſe of Sion Colledge viſited, is he therefore the foundation of the booke, or of the ſuppoſed feebleneſſe of it which he diſcovers.*

Anſw. Your *jeering* betrayes your *ignorance*, or malitious *forgetfulneſſe* of that knowne diſtinction of *fides quæ creditur*, and *fides quâ creditur*. The *matter* which faith beleeves, and the *grace* it ſelfe of faith, both called *faith* in Scripture. *Religion* alſo comprehends the *matter of Religion* and the *grace* of *Religion*. The *Scriptures* though they are not the *foundation* of the *matter* of Religion, yet by their manifeſtation of the will of God, they are the *foundation* of the *grace* of Religion, as my booke called *the Buſie Biſhop* if it have manifeſted the feebleneſſe of *Sion Colledge viſited*, may be the *foundation* upon which ſome may build the *knowledge* of the feebleneſſe of *Sion Colledge viſited*, though it be not the *foundation* of your *booke*, or the *weakneſſe* of it.

3 In this *exception* you produce that queſtion which I propounded to you, p. 7. *Buſ. Biſh. Why doth Maſter* Goodwin *alleadge that Scripture*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11. *Other foundation can no man lay but Jeſus Chriſt, if he doth not ground his beliefe hereof upon this very Scripture?*

Yo. Eld. p. 31.

To this you give a double anſwer; 1. By way of *quære*, *Why did Chriſt cite the teſtimony of* John *to prove himſelfe to be the Meſſias, if he did not ground his beliefe of his being the Meſſias upon* Johns *teſtimony?*

Joh. 5. 32. 33. &c.

Anſw. 1 When will you leave off *to blaſpheme?* Its my unhappineſſe that inſtead of reclaiming you from *hereſie*, you ſhould take occaſion from my words to vent your *blaſphemy*. Do you no more need the Scriptures than Chriſt did? Did Chriſt cite the teſtimony of *John* as a ground for his *owne* faith, or as a ground for the faith of others? Doth Maſter *Goodwin* never read the Scriptures that ſay, *Chriſt* is the *Meſſias* but only for the eſtabliſhing the faith of others?

Youngl. Elder, pag. 6.

2 You anſwer by way of ſuppoſition; *What if I ſhould ſay that I do ground my beliefe of Chriſt his being the only foundation upon this place which followes?*

1 It followes that you cite not this teſtimony as *Chriſt* did the

the teſtimony of *John*, who did not cite *Johns* teſtimony to ground his owne beliefe upon it that he was the *Meſſias*. 2. It followes that you *contradict* your ſelfe, for now you ſay this Scripture is the *foundation* of your faith in *Chriſt*; and before you ſaid, that becauſe *Chriſt* is the *only* foundation, therefore the *Scriptures* are not.

Before you ſaid, that only the *matter* and *truths* contained in the *Scripture* were the *foundation of faith*, and not the *written Word* which contained thoſe truths; and now you grant that the *written Word of God*, 1 Corinth. 3. 11. is *the ground of your faith*.

3 If you meane as you ſpeake, the controverſie is at an end, *the written word* being acknowledged *a foundation of faith*; and all thoſe *Sophiſmes* inſtead of Arguments, which afterward you bring, concerne you to anſwer, as well as my ſelfe.

In this exception.

4 You revile me for charging you with *weakneſſe* and *wickedneſſe* in your oppoſing *Chriſt* and his *Word*, ſince you ſay, that a while ſince *I oppoſed a foundation Perſonall* to a *foundation Scripturall*, and what is that (ſay you) but to oppoſe *Chriſt* and his *Word* as much as you *oppoſe* them. And *for the knowne diſtinction of* eſſendi *and* cognoſcendi, *which Maſter* Jenkin *wonders ſhould be hid from me, he is deſired in his next to produce any Claſſique Author that ever uſed it but himſelfe. The complexion of it is, as if it were of the lineage of Mr.* Jenkins *learning*. *To. Eld. p. 31, 32.*

Anſw. You can finde no ſhelter from any thing that ever dropt from my Pen, for your oppoſing *Chriſt* and his *Word*; you *oppoſe* Chriſt and his Word, I *diſtinguiſh* only between Chriſt and his Word; now Accurate Logicians know the difference between *oppoſitio* and *diſtinctio*, though *old dotards* have forgot it. Oppoſition implyes a *pugna rerum*, diſtinction only a *non identitas*; ſo Keckerm. cap. 5. Lib. 1. Syſt. Lo. *Suminus vocem diſtinctionis cum omnibus eruditis Philoſophis, oppoſitioni contradiviſive, prout nude oppponitur identitati, excludendo diverſitatem.* You ſo oppoſe *Chriſt* and his Word, as that becauſe *Chriſt* is the *foundation*, you deny the *Scripture* to be a foundation, *Sion Colledge viſited*, p. 2. 15. this is *Pugna*, but I ſhew *Bu. Biſh.* p. 7, 8. how they both agree, though they be not one and the ſame foundation;

that *Christ* is the *foundation* upon which I build for *salvation*, and the *Scriptures* the *foundation* upon which I ground the *knowledge* of this Saviour; your saying therefore that becauſe I diſtinguiſh thus between a *foundation Perſonall*, and a *foundation Scripturall*, I therefore oppoſe them as much as you, who make the word of *Chriſt a foundation* inconſiſtent with *Chriſt's* being a *foundation*, againe bewrayes your forgetfulneſſe of your *Logick*, for every *oppoſition* implyes neceſſarily a *diſtinction*, but a *diſtinction* doth not imply an *oppoſition*.

And whereas with ſufficient ignorance you deſire me to tell you of any *Claſſique Author* that uſeth the *diſtinction* of *eſſendi* and *cognoſcendi*, I referre you for information to *Keckerman*, *Syſt. Theol. p.* 133. where he ſaith, *Duplicia reperiuntur principia eſſendi & cognoſcendi, ſic etiam in Theologiâ*, See alſo *Trelcatius jun. Inſtit. Theol. L.* 1. *Duo ſunt principia rei & cognitionis, illa ex quibus alia producuntur hæc ex quibus aliorum pendet cognitio. Wollebius* alſo, *Comp. Theol. p.* 2. *Principium Theologiæ eſſendi quidem Deus eſt. Cognoſcendi vero verbum Dei.* See alſo *Altenſtaig Lexicon, Theolog. in Tit. Principium*, where there is mention of *ſundry learned* men that uſe *this diſtinction*. If the *complexion* of this *diſtinction* ſhewes that it is of the *lineage* of my *learning*, certainly the *ignorance* of *this diſtinction* ſhewes the *complexion* of Maſter *Goodwins* learning.

2. To prove that the *Scriptures* are not the foundation of *religion*, you now proceed to your *arguments*, and in your entrance upon them you brag that you demonſtrate, and you thunder out the *ſhame and confuſion of all thoſe that have charged the error upon you*; (though the iſſue will prove to your owne confuſion, I ſay not to your *ſhame* who I think are paſt it.)

Yo. El. p. 32.

Your owne words are theſe; *That the Scriptures whether written or printed are not truly and properly the foundation of religion, I demonſtrate in the ſight of the Sun, to the ſhame and confuſion of all thoſe faces, who have charged the Tenet upon me as an error.* O yes, all men, women, and children, ſtand forty foot off from the blinde Beare, if not, being bitten thanke your ſelves.

Baſ. Moral. reg. 26. cap. 1 Δεῖ πᾶν ῥῆμα ἢ πρᾶγμα πίστεως τῆ μαρτυρίᾳ τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς εἰς πληροφορίαν τῆς ἀληθοῦς εὐσεβείας. 1 What do you call a *Theologicall* demonſtration? have you read the rule of *Baſil*; *Whatever we ſay or doe, ought to be confirmed by*

by the testimony of the holy Scriptures, for the establishing of the good, and the confusion of the bad? Have you done thus? certainly the *Scriptures* have not given to you a *weapon*, nor lent you a *proofe* to destroy themselves. No Sir, your *demonstrations* are either childish mistakes, or Popish cavills; not *demonstrations* of your *position*, but of your *folly* and *impiety*.

2 To what purpose doe you bring any Arguments at all? Are you not *respondent?* Was it not your part to *answer* what was brought against your wicked Position? but you are better (you thinke) at your *sword* than your *shield* (though at neither good) otherwise why have you passed over what was brought against you, and instead thereof vainly endeavour to bring somewhat in opposition to your opponent? *Ad bonam solutionem non pertinet quod probet conclusionem sed quod defendat eam ab objectione contrariâ.*

3 Doth it become an *Accurate disputant* to propose a question under so many *ambiguities*, and *explaine none*; what meane you by *Scripture?* what by *foundation?* what by *religion?* what by *true and proper?* are these two words ισοδυναμουντα of the same *importance?* why leave you things so confused and indigested? Is it to make your opponent ashamed with *your folly*, because you cannot with your *arguments?* That we may not therefore fight blind-fold, at which you are *old excellent*, I shall desire the Reader to take notice, that in this whole *dispute*, when you deny the *Scriptures* to be the *foundation of religion*.

By *Scriptures* are understood *all the books of the Old and New Testament*, conjunctim & divisim, *as they are now received and acknowledged among us*, conjunctim, *the compleat foundation*; divisim, the partiall *foundation*, and your selfe grant that thus your opponents take the Scriptures. You acknowledge this to be the *only sence that the ordinance against Heresies can reasonably meane*, *Hag. Sect.* 26, 27. and so you take the word *Scriptures*, *p.* 32. *Yo. Eld.* where you labour to prove them not *the foundation of religion*. Now whereas you assert that by the *Scriptures* we are not to understand any *writing*, *or the written Word* that reveales the truths of God, but only the *truths and matters themselves named*; I affirme, that the Scriptures are to be taken *concretivè* both for *matter and words*, both being inspired of the Holy Ghost. (*In iis omnibus quæ per supernaturalem revelationem innotuerunt, non solum res ipsas inspiravit Deus, sed etiam singula verba* *Ames. med. c. de ser,*

Scriptnres.

Yo. El. p. 32.

quibus scriberentur, dictavit atque suggessit. The holy Ghost suggesteth words as well as matter, saith *Ames*, and the forme of the Scripture standsin the manifestation of the true Doctrine in words, which came from the immediate revelation of the holy Ghost, saith *Gomarus. Materia Scripturæ circa quam, est tota veræ religionis doctrina ad salutem necessaria Ecclesiæ; forma Scripturæ est totius doctrinæ de veræ religione ad salutem necessariæ ex immediatâ revelatione Sp: sancti conceptis ipsius verbis significatio. Gomar. de script. sanct. Disp. 2. Id. ibid. ut verbum non scriptum sermonis signo & enuntiatione sic contra verbum scriptum, literarum notis, &* Foundation. *descriptione constat*) and both matter and words are preserved by the *providence* of God so pure till this day, that they are still the *foundation of Religion*; the *matter* the foundation *which* we must beleeve, or the *objectum materiale* (this you grant) the *writing by the appointment of God*, the *foundation why* we must beleeve, or the *objectum formale*, into which our faith must be *last* resolved, and this you deny, and I maintaine against your following cavils, it being the thing in question betweene us.

Religion. Whereas Religion may signifie either the *matter* of it, *viz.* the *things beleeved*, or the *habit* of it, *i. e.* the *beleeving* of these things, I assert that the *Scriptures* are the *foundation of Religion* not as *Religion* is considered in *it self*, or in the *matter of* it, but as it is *in us*, and considered in the *grace and habit* of it.

True and proper. Whereas you joyne together (*True and proper*) words of a vast difference, 'tis affirmed that the Scriptures are the true foundation, though not the proper, as *Christ* when he cals himself the *vine*, the *doore*, spake *truly* though *figuratively*, and so not *properly*. So that the question is not whether the *foundation* or *fundamentals*, the great *articles* of faith *be contained* in the Scriptures, this *Master Goodwin* acknowledgeth, *Divine Author*, *pag.* 17. repeated in your last book, *sect.* 37.

Nor is the question whether *ink and paper* be the foundation; *a conceit so senceless*, that it would never have come into the head of any man but Master *Goodwin* and such as are left of God to blaspheme; *inke and paper* being the externall *matter* of any writings whatsoever, as well as the holy *Scriptures*.

But the *question is*, whether *Christian faith which beleeveth the truths of Christian Religion necessary to salvation, be built upon the divine authority of the written Word, in which God hath been pleased to reveale*

reveale thoſe truths. This Maſter Goodwin denyeth in ſundry paſſages in his *Hagiomaſtix* and in his *Divine Authority of the Scripture.* This he diſputes againſt in his *Youngling Elder*, and in this ſenſe he endeavours to anſwer what I bring in *Buſie Biſhop*, *Hagiom. ſect.* 28. he denyes it to be *any foundation of Religion to beleeve that the Engliſh Scriptures, or the books called the Bible, are the Word of God.*

Div. Auth. page 10. he denyes the *Engliſh Scriptures* and the *Hebrew and greek Originals themſelves to be the Word of God, &c.*

Yo. Eld. page 29. he ſaith, *When I deny the Scripture to be the foundation of Religion, I meane by the Scriptures inke and paper; And* whatever elſe is *found in them, or appertaining to them, beſides the truths, matter, and gracious counſels concerning the ſalvation of the world which are contained in them, &c.*

In direct oppoſition to which deteſtable paſſage, I aſſert that by Scriptures or foundation of faith, we are not onely to underſtand the *gracious counſels*, or their *materia circa quam*, as *Gomarus* ſpeaks, the *doctrines* of ſalvation, but their *form* alſo, or the *ſignification from God of theſe Doctrines in the written Word, or in letters, or writing.*

And page 39. *Yo. Eld.* he diſputes (after his manner, dotingly, a weak hand beſt beſeeming a wicked work) againſt the *written Word. If it be impoſſible* (ſaith he) *to beleeve that the matter of the Scriptures is the Word of God, if I be uncertaine whether the written Word be the Word of God or no; how came the Patriarchs who lived in the firſt two thouſand yeares of the world to beleeve it, ſince it was uncertaine to them, whether ſuch a word ſhould ever be written.* Here's more oppoſed than ink & paper, *viz.* the written Word.

I ſhall now examine his arguments, having briefly premiſed theſe following conſiderations, for the further explaining of the queſtion.

1. *The end of mans creation was to glorifie God, and to ſave his owne ſoule.*

2. *The right way of Gods Worſhip and mans ſalvation could not be found out by the light of nature, but there was neceſſarily required a ſupernaturall revelation of this way.*

3. *God was therefore pleaſed to manifeſt his own will concerning it.*

4. *This he hath done from the foundation of the world diverſly, after divers manners.*

5. *In the infancy of the Church, and while it was contained in narrow bounds, God manifested his will without the written Word by dreames, visions, audible voice, &c.*

6. *When the Church was further extended, more increased, and to be set as a City upon an hill, and when impiety abounded in mens lives, God commanded this his will formerly revealed to be set downe in writing.*

7. *God did infallibly guide holy men whom he did chuse for his Amanuenses, that they did not erre in the matter of his will, or manner of expressing of it.*

8. *He ordered that his will should be written in such Languages, as were best knowne and understood in the Churches, unto whom his truths were committed.*

9. *He hath given a charge to his Churches to have recourse to these writings onely, to be informed what were the truths and matters of his will, and to try and prove all doctrines by those writings.*

10. Therefore *the onely instrument upon which the Church now can ground their knowledge and beliefe of the truths, matters, gracious counsels of God, revealed for his owne glory and their salvation, is the written Word or holy Scriptures.*

These things thus premised, I come to your arguments which you are pleased to honour with the name of *Demonstrations.*

Arg. 1. To. El. pag. 32. To prove that the Scriptures are not the *foundation* of Religion, your first argument is this: *If Religion was founded, built, &c. before the Scriptures were, then cannot the Scripture be the foundation of Religion, but Religion was built and founded before, &c. therefore——*

Answ. *Eccius Enchiri. Tit. 1. Bailius. q. 1. Bellar. de verb. dei, l. 4. c. 4.* Should I tell you that your *demonstration* (if demonstration it must be called) is *stollen* out of *Papists* in their writings against *Protestants*, it would by you be accounted but a slight charge; brasse cannot blush. For answer I deny your consequence; Though Religion was built, and stood firme before the *Scriptures* were, it followes not that the *Scriptures* now are not the *foundation* of *Christian Religion.* Though the *Scriptures* were not alway heretofore the *foundation* of *Religion*, it followes not but that they must be now the *foundation* thereof. God teacheth his Church, and revealeth his will *diverslie*; he hath *varied* the

wayes

wayes of his *administrations*; and his will being presupposed, the Scriptures are now necessary as a *foundation*, which in former times were not. The learned *Rivet* tels us, *Meritò ridemus, We account it a ridiculous consequence, That because formerly the Church was without the Scriptures, therefore now it can want them.* The same solution doth *Gerrard* also make, *Exeg.* p. 16. *Quia non nisi per Scripturas, &c. Because God in the businesse of our salvation would deale with us but by the Scriptures, upon this supposition they are now necessary.*

Rivet. t. 1. c. 1. *Aliud tempus alios mores postulat. Deus pro multiformi sua sapientia, administrationis suæ rationem voluit variare.*

Consequentias adversariorum meritò ridemus; fuit aliquando Ecclesia cum non esset Scriptura ergo hoc tempore Ecclesia potest carere Scriptura. præ suppositâ Dei voluntate nobis necessariam esse Scripturam asserimus.

The like saith *Whitaker: God of old time familiarly made known himselfe to the Fathers, and by himselfe manifested to them his will, and then I confesse the Scriptures were not necessary, but after God did change the way or course of teaching his Church, and would have his will written, then the Scriptures began to become necessary.* The *materiall object* of the faith of those that lived before the *Canon* was put into writing, was the same with ours; they built their faith upon *Christ*; they beleeved the same truths for salvation; but the *formall object* of their faith, or the ground of beleeving those truths, differed from ours in the manner of its *dispensation*. Divine Revelation was the *foundation* and *ground* of their *faith* and is of ours also, but *divine revelation* was afforded to them after one manner, and to us after another, *God hath spoken in divers manners*, Heb. 1. 1. The authority of the *revelation* is alwaies the same, the way of making that *revelation*, hath frequently been different, sometimes immediately by *visions*, a *lively voice*, &c. at other times by *writing*, as now in these latter times; upon which consideration I flatly deny, that because their Religion stood firme before the Word was written, or before God revealed his *will in writing*, therefore our religion is not built upon *revelation* of God in writing; concluding my answer with that excellent passage of *Tilenus*, Syntag. Disp. 2. *Licet plane eadem sint quæ olim voce, quæq; deinceps scripto fuerunt tradita, ἀσφάλεια, tamen & fidei nostræ πληροφορία scriptis duntaxat nititur. Although the things which were formerly delivered by voice, were altogether the same with the things afterward delivered in writing, yet the certainty*

Whitak. de perfec. Scrip. cap. 7. *Patribus olim Deus se familiariter ostendit atq; iis per se voluntatem suam patefecit, & tum Scripturas non fuisse necessarias fateor: at postea mutavit hanc docendæ ecclesiæ rationem & scribi suam voluntatem voluit, tum necessaria esse scriptura cœpit. Alia illorum: alia horum temporum ratio.*

tainty of our faith only depends upon writings.

Arg. 2. Your ſecond Argument to prove that the Scriptures are not the foundation of Religion, is becauſe *The foundation of Religion is unperiſhable, even as is the Church (you ſay) which is built upon it; now you ſay, any booke and all books whatſoever, and conſequently the Scriptures, are periſhable, therefore no books and conſequently not the Scriptures are this foundation.* If Maſter *Jenkins Bible be the foundation of his Religion, then is his Religion no ſuch treaſure but that thieves may breake through and ſteale it from him.*

Diogenes hearing that Plato had given the definition of a man, that he was a living creature with two feet without feathers, gets a cock and puls off all his feathers while he was alive, and throws him in among ſome of Plato's *ſcholliers, wiſhing them to behold their Maſter* Plato *his man. If ſome ſuch odde conceited fellow ſhould uſe means to get Maſter Jenkins Bible, and having defaced, rent and torne it, ſhould caſt it into the midſt of his auditors, and ſay,* Ecce fundamentum Religionis Jenkinianæ, *Behold the foundation of your Maſter Jenkin, it might prove a more effectuall conviction unto him of his folly, than ſeven demonſtrative reaſons, &c.*

Anſw. You ſay the *foundation* of Religion is as the Church *unperiſhable*, This poſition, if you underſtand of a *ſimple and abſolute unperiſhableneſſe*, I deny; for though both *Church and Scriptures* upon which the *Church* is built be *unperiſhable, ex hypotheſi divinæ providentiæ*, in regard of Gods providence, which he hath promiſed ſhall preſerve the *Scriptures and Church*, yet *of themſelves* they might periſh.

It was poſſible in it ſelfe that *Chriſts leggs* as well as the *leggs* of the *thieves* might have been *broken*, but Gods *pleaſure* preſuppoſed it was altogether *impoſſible*. As for your arguing from the tearing of my Bible, to the aboliſhing of the Scriptures, you ſhew your ſelf as good as your word, for this is one of the arguments which you bring to *the ſhame of thoſe that charge this errour upon you*; my ſelf among ſundry others being aſhamed of your childiſhneſſe herein; have you any ſuch ground of aſſurance from God, that any one particular Bible ſhall not be burnt, as you have that his written Word ſhall not *be utterly removed from his Church*? or can the periſhing of my Bible prove that God will ſuffer the Scriptures to be utterly taken away?

Reve-

Reverend Mr. *Bifield* upon the first of *Peter*, ver. 25. p. 506. will tell you though this or that particular Bible may be destroyed, yet *that the Word abideth for ever in the very writings of it. If all the power on earth* (saith he) *should make war against the very paper of the Scriptures, they cannot destroy it, but the word of God written will be to be had still. It is easier to destroy heaven and earth than to destroy the Bible.* So he; you say the *Scriptures* are as *unperishable as the Church*; but can you conclude because the *Church* in it self may faile, and may cease in this or that particular place, therefore that it may be overthrown in all parts and places of the world: And therefore for that contemptible because profane scoffe of *Platoe's* man, or *a living creature with two feet without feathers*, had you added one accident more, that he is *animal latis unguibus*, it would more properly have belonged to your self than *animal rationale*; your *nayles* being much sharper than your *arguments*, a fit *cock* for such a *cock-pit* as you *game* in.

Your third argument is, That *if any books called the Scripture be the foundation of Religion, then may Religion be said to have been founded by men.* *Arg. 3.*

It would be to no purpose haply to tell you that this is a popish cavill; however to the Reader it may not be unprofitable to know so much. See *Stapleton, lib. 9. c. 4.* and we see his servant also following him. In your argument I deny the consequence, for though the *written word* be the *foundation* of *Religion*, yet cannot *Religion* be said to be *founded* by *men*, without borrowing *blasphemies* from Master *Goodwin*, who hath enough to furnish all the town; the *written word* had not men for the Authors of it, but onely for the *Amanuenses* or *pen-men* of it, who indeed rather were the *pens* **in the hand of God, when he wrote unto his Church*; and we may looke upon men in this consideration and capacity, and yet not upon either Scriptures or Religion as founded by men: *holy men inspired by the holy Ghost wrote and spake. 2 Pet. 1, 19, 21.* The holy Ghost did both put them upon, and direct them in the worke of writing; and therefore though the word were *written* by them, yet not *founded by them* or upon them, and by consequence not Religion. *Answ.*

* Greg. praf. in job, cap. 1. *Si magni cujusdam viri suscepti Epistolis, verba legeremus, eaq; quo calamo fuissent Scripta quæreremus, ridiculum profectò esset &c. cum ergo cognoscimus, ejusq; rei spiritum sanctum auctorem tenemus, cum scriptorem quærimus quid aliud legimus, nisi legentes literas de calamo perscrutari.*

Your fourth argument seems too weake to be owned by Mr. *Goodwin*, or any other man that ever pretended to *a competent share in common sence*,

Yo. El. p. 34. 'Tis this: *If thoſe tables of ſtone wherein the Law was written by the finger of God, were not the foundation of obedience exhibited to the Law, then neither is any* Bible *or booke the foundation of Religion.*

Anſw. This thing which you call a *demonſtration* toucheth not the *queſtion*; for it is onely framed againſt the *paper* of the Bible, and ſo indeed and no otherwiſe it *holds good*, for the *paper* of our Bibles, and the *ſtone* wherein the Law was written, are *foundations* both alike, of obedience and Religion. But its ridiculous to argue from the unfitneſſe of the *ſtone* and *paper* to be *foundations*, to the denyall of the *written word* to be a *foundation*, your conſequence therefore is a *creple*.

To the proofe of it which you pretend to bring in theſe words, *Doubtleſſe there is as much reaſon to judge thoſe two tables which are ſaid to have been the work of God, and the writing therein, the writing of God graven upon the tables to have been the foundation of the Law, and of the obedience to it, as to judge any book whatſoever either written or printed, to be the foundation of that religion, the principles whereof are contained in it.* I anſwer:

1. You joyne together things that are of a different nature, *the Law* and the *obedience to it*; the queſtion was not concerning the *former*, whether the writing in the *tables* was the *foundation* of the *Law*, but of the *latter*, whether it were not the *foundation* of *obedience* to it.

2. There's not as much reaſon to judge the two *tables* which were *ſtone* a *foundation* of *obedience*, as there is to judge the *revelation* of the will of God by *writing* in our *Bibles*.

3. If you intend, that the *writing* of God in thoſe two Tables which were broken was as much the *foundation* of obedience to the *Iſraelites*, as the *Revelation* of the will of God by *writing* is *now* to us, I deny that alſo, becauſe God foreſaw and intended that thoſe *numericall tables* ſhould be broken, and that the writing upon them ſhould periſh and not be communicated to the people to be a *foundation* of their *obedience*; howbeit if you deny the *writing in* the *ſecond tables*, and in that *booke* that was *before the Prieſt*, out of which the *King* was commanded to *take a copy, that he might reade and learne to feare God*, Deut. 17. 18. to have been the *foundation* of *obedience* unto the Law, I expect ſtronger arguments from you than any of theſe *demonſtrations* you have brought in your *Yo. El.* Your

Your fifth thing which you desire to have us looke upon as a *demonstration*, is drawn from the *inconsistency* of the *foundation* of *Religion* with it self, if any book or books whatsoever be the *foundation* of *Christian Religion*; in regard of the *Errours which you say may possibly be found in every copy now extant in the world, by reason of the negligence, ignorance, &c. of the Scribes, &c.* *Arg.* 5. Yo. El. p. 35

You live upon stealing: *Stapleton is still your friend, you plow with his heifer, Prin. Doct. lib. 9. cap. 5. Arg.* 4. he useth this very argument, and he is abundantly answered by *Chamier, Panstr. lib.* 12. *cap.* 10. *Salom. Glassius, lib.* 1. *t.* 1, *tr.* 1. 2. *de puritate textus.* Your consequence is denyed, *viz. If any books whatsoever, bible or other be the foundation of Religion, then is not the foundation of Religion in every thing consistent with it selfe.* The reason of your *proposition* (*you say, you should have said of your consequence*) is a *bold assertion*, of which you offer not the *least proof*, of *errours* that may be found in *every copy* now extant, which may render the copy contradictious to it selfe. *Answ.*

1 *A double minded man is unstable in all his wayes.* Remember you what you asserted *Divine Author, p* 257. *God hath kept the Scriptures from being corrupted or depraved, that is, from any such alteration or change in the words, whether by transposition, pointing, or otherwise, whereby the nature or proper sence of them should be impaired or cast out, or a sence that is spurious and unsound brought in in the stead thereof.* Why is your *Hosanna* to the Scriptures turned so soone into a *crucifie them?*

2 Whether grant you that ever there was any copy in the world *pure* and without *errours*, and so not liable to this exception of yours; if there were not, how hath God left his Church an unerring stedfast *rule of faith* and life, and how is the Word called a *Canon*, 6*Gal.* If there were, whether grant you that the *written Word* in that *pure and unerring* copy was the Word of God, and so the *foundation* of Religion; if you do grant it, you contradict your self, who have said all this while, *No writing whatsoever is the Word of God*; if you grant not *that purely written Word* to be a *foundation* of Religion, (as its cleare you do not) to what purpose argue you against the Word for *being corrupted*, when as you do not deny the *written Word* to be a *foundation quâ corrupted* but *quâ* delivered in the way of *writing*. 3. In your next

I pray bring in your instances of those *Typographicall Sphalmata*, & errors found in *every Copy* that render the Scriptures thus contradictious to themselves; and 4. prove that the same power which keeps the Scriptures from *perishing*, doth not also keepe them *pure*. If God by his written Word gathers and preserves his Church to the *end of the world*, then certainly he defends it from being *corrupted*, for there must be a *sufficiencie* between the *rule* and the *thing regulated*, pure and incorrupted *Doctrine* requires a pure and incorrupted *Scripture*, according whereunto it is to be *examin'd*, and by which it is to be *tryed*. Take away the *purity* of the *written Word*, and the purity of *Doctrine* taken out of the *written Word* (as *Glassius* saith) must needs *fall to the ground*; and what proofe can be taken out of the Scriptures against errours, if this be admitted *the Scriptures are corrupted*, as saith *Augustine*. And 5. further, prove from the false printing in some Copies that therefore the Canon or *written Word* is depraved, shew that becausе some *words* may be written *wrong*, therefore the *written Word* of God is corrupted. Ceaseth it not so farre to be Gods Word, as any thing is printed against the minde of the Lord the Revealer? Is this purity of the *Canon* at the *courtesie* of a Printers boy? Mans word may be inserted, but Gods not by him depraved; something may be represented instead of the Word, but the Word is not corrupted by that mis-representation. He that can make Gods Word to become his own, that is, humane & corrupt, may with the same labour make his own word to become Gods, and of divine Authority. Nay, prove the errors of the edition (*E.G.* of our new Translation) from the errors of the Copies, learne of the more learned *Chamier*, Paust. I. 12. c. 10. *Ipsa ratio cogit ut codices distinguamus ab editione, hæc enim profecta a primo principio, illi quotidie sunt authoritate privatâ, vel cujus libet voluntate; ergo non bene concluditur à singulis codicibus adversus primariam editionem.* We cannot conclude from some Copies against an edition.

Tolle puritatem verbi dei scripti & ultrò collabescet doctrinæ ex verbo desumptæ puritas. Glas. p. 174.

Quod documentum ad convincendos errores exeri potest, si hæc vox admittatur scripturas esse corruptas. Aug. L. Cont. Faust. Manic. c. 2.

Arg. 6. To. Eld. p. 35

The true and proper foundation of Religion is not any thing that is visible, or exposed to the outward sences, but something spirituall, and apprehensible only by the understanding, &c. but Bibles, or the Scriptures are legible, and may be seene.

Answ. The *foundation* of Religion taken *materially* for the *truths* contained

contained in Scripture, the things beleeved, or *fundamentum fidei quod* is inviſible, and not expoſed to *outward ſence*, but taken *formally* for the *fundamentum propter quod*, or for which faith yeeldeth aſſent unto the matter beleeved, for as much as God worketh *mediately*, and now revealeth no truth to us but by *externall meanes*, and *Divine Authority* of it ſelfe is hidden and unknowne, the thing into which faith is ultimately reſolved muſt be ſomething *externally knowne*, which we may *read or heare*, and you muſt either yeeld an *externall foundation and formall object* of faith, or elſe lead us to *ſecret revelations*. *Vid. White, way to the Church, p. 378*

The *materiall object* of faith comprehends the Articles of faith, as that God is one in eſſence, and three in perſon; that Chriſt dyed, and roſe againe the third day, &c. but the *formall object* of faith, or the reaſon wherefore I give aſſent unto theſe matters and Articles of faith is Authority Divine revealed in *writing*.

Nor 2. is your Conſequence true, viz. *If any booke be the foundation, then is the foundation ſomewhat viſible, &c.* becauſe our diſpute is not about *Inke and Paper*, *Bookes*, or *words materially* conſidered, which are the *object of ſight*, but about *words* and *bookes* as they are *ſigna conceptuum*, and ſo diſcernable only by the *underſtanding*, *Verbis & vocibus per ſe & materialiter conſideratis nulla ineſt vis*, ſaith *Keckerman*.

3. How wretchedly weak is your proofe, that *nothing externall is the foundation of faith*; becauſe then (ſay you) *there is nothing neceſſary to be beleeved by any man to make him religious but what he ſees with his eyes, &c.* And (by the way) I pray anſwer; Is any thing to be beleeved to make a man religious, but what may be ſeene *written* in the Scriptures? what a diſputer *rampant* have we here? And you ſay, *every man that did but looke into a Bible, and ſee ſuch and ſuch ſentences written or printed there, and beleeved accordingly, that theſe words and ſentences were here written and printed, muſt needs hereby become truly religious, &c.* *To. Eld. p. 35*

Thinke you (dreadfull Sir) by ſuch ſtuffe as this to make your friend *William* of your judgement? though the *Word written* be the *foundation* of *Religion*, doth it follow that there is nothing neceſſary to be beleeved for the making of a man religious but this, to *beleeve* that ſuch and ſuch things *are written*;

is it not also required that a man should beleeve the truths of the word, because *they are written from God* as well as that he sees they are written?

The Assent to the *truth* of the things written is faith, and not only that the things are written; what can you say against this proposition, *Whosoever beleeves with his heart the things that are writen in these bookes, because the first beleeves that these bookes in which he sees them written are the oracles of God, is truly religious.*

Argm. 7. Your seventh *commodity* which you call a *demonstration*, is the same with the second; only it containes an absurdity or two more not worth the reciting.

To. Eld p. 38. Your Argument is this; *The true and proper foundation of religion is intrinsecally, essentially, and in the nature of it unchangeable and unalterable in the least, by the wills, pleasures, or attempts of men; but there is no book or books whatsoever, Bible or other, but in the contents of them they may be altered and changed by men. Ergo:*

Answ. It seemes you are much pleased with the blasphemy of the *Jesuits* against the Scriptures, drawne from their corruption; *your second Argument was* drawne from the *perishablenesse* of them; your fifth was, *they are corruptible*; your seventh, *they are changeable*. Your major I deny not, if it only import, that the *foundation of religion* admits not of the least change in the *essence or nature* of it by men; but if it import that it is repugnant to the nature of the *foundation* to be changed in the *least*, though this change be only *accidentall*, I deny it.

The proofe of your major, (viz. *That if the foundation of religion were intrinsecally and in the nature of it changeable, then can it not be any matter of truth, because the nature of truth is like the nature of God, unchangeable*) bewrayes your *ignorance*, or your *dotage*, or something *worse*, though ordinary with you; what created *veritie* is there that is as unchangeable as God, and which God cannot change? Is it *veritas metaphysica*, or the truth of *being*? Cannot God *annihilate* all created *beings*, and if so what becomes of their *verity*? Is it Logicall truth, or truth of Propositions? Doth it not cease upon the change of the subject? *Jesus Christ is to come in the flesh* was once a true proposition, and the *object* of the faith of those that lived before Christ his Incarnation, but is it so still? and is not *veritas ethica*, or the agree-

ment

ment of the judgement or minde with the propoſition, changeable likewiſe upon the ſame ground.

To your minor, whereas you *alledge the changeableneſſe of all* Bibles in the contents of them, what meane you by contents? meane you inke, papers, letters, &c. ſuch changes either pervert the ſence, and ſo farre as the Scriptures are thus chang'd they ceaſe to be the *written Word*, or they pervert it not, and if any ſuch changes be, they nothing hinder the *written Word* from being the *foundation* of faith. *Sphalmata Typographica*, Typographicall faults makeerrours in Orthography, none in Divinity. *Waleus*, T. 1. p. 129. *Scriptura ſubſtantiâ non poteſt corrumpi.*

Your laſt demonſtration; *If the Scripture be the true foundation of Religion, it muſt be underſtood either of the Scriptures as in the originall Languages only, or only as tranſlated into other Languages, or as both; but the Scriptures neither in the originall Languages, nor as tranſlated, nor as both are the foundations. Ergo:* *Arg. 3. To. Eld. p. 36.*

I deny your minor, and aſſert the *Scriptures* as in the *originals*, and alſo as *tranſlated* ſo farre as agreeing with the *originals* are the *foundation.* *Anſw.*

1. How prove you that the Scriptures in the originalls are not the foundation of religion? thus; *If the Scriptures be the foundation as they are in the originall Bibles, then they* (ſay you) *that underſtand not theſe Languages, as illiterate men, cannot build upon this foundation*; for your unworthy ſcoffe of the danger of my Religion, you repreſenting me as one that underſtands not the *originals*; you may pleaſe to know that I am not ignorant of all originals, for either concerning your *ſcoffing*, or your unmannerly *jeering*; Mr. *T. G.* ſaid lately, that you had it from your *Father* (*cheap* enough it ſeemes) but to the point: This cavill is borrowed of your old Maſters whom in this point you follow; already anſwered by *Anth. Wotton, Pop. Artic. Ar.* 3 *p.* 20. and by *Baronius* againſt *Turnbul. de objecto formali fid.* p. 44. but I anſwer:

Illiterate or unlearned men who cannot underſtand originals, nor yet can read tranſlations, doe build nevertheleſſe their faith upon the *Scriptures* contained in them, though mediatly, virtually, and not with that diſtinctneſſe which one learned doth, the unlearned knowing not particularly in what words *Anſw.*

the

the minde of God was revealed; though you call me a *Novice*, yet let me teach you (if at leaſt ſo plaine a leſſon hath not hitherto been learned by you) that unto faith there is required, *Principium quod*, or the foundation to be beleeved; *Principium propter quod*, or the reaſon why men beleeve the former; and *media per quæ*, thoſe *neceſſary meanes* by which they come to *beleeve*, and theſe are *externall*, the miniſtery of the Word, and *internall*, the witneſſe and effectuall working of the *holy Ghoſt*, by which the heart is enabled *to cloſe* with the *formall object* of faith, viz. the *revelation of Gods will in writing*. Now the Miniſtry of the Word and Spirit are limited to the *written Word*; theſe teach no other things than God hath *revealed therein*, and *perſwade not men, but God* (as the Apoſtle ſaith, *Gal.* 1. 10.) ſo that theſe lead the moſt *illiterate* to the *Scriptures*, and are ſo adminiſtred that they draw the heart even *of ſuch* to aſſent to the *written Word*, as that into which their *faith* is *ultimately reſolved*, as the Scriptures abundantly teſtifie; and you can no more conclude from the ſtrangeneſſe of the originall Languages to thoſe that are illiterate, that illiterate perſons doe not build their faith upon the *written Word* contained in them, than that one who only underſtands the *Engliſh* tongue and receives a Letter from his Father in the *French* tongue (for the explaining whereof, the Father hath appointed an *Interpreter*) builds not *his obedience ultimately* upon the *writing* of his *Father*, though in a ſtrange tongue.

2. You endeavour to prove that the Scriptures are not the *foundation of Religion*, as in *Tranſlations* and *Originalls*, thus; *If they be this foundation in both thoſe conſiderations, or as well in the one or the other, then two things or more, ſpecifically differing one from another, may notwithſtanding be one and the ſame numeriall thing,*

Anſw. You ſhould rather have laid your conſequence thus, *then one ſubject numerically the ſame may be the ſubject of accidents ſpecifically different*; but you tell me of two *ſuppoſitions* upon which your conſequence ſtands.

1. *That the foundation of Religion is but one and the ſame numerically.*

2. *That the Scriptures in ſeverall Languages differ ſpecifically among themſelves.*

About

About the identy of the *foundation numerically*, I ſhall not contend; but how prove you your *ſecond ſuppoſition?* viz. That the Scriptures in ſeverall Languages differ ſpecifically, you indeavour it thus:

Two things (you ſay) *which differ more than numerically, differ ſpecifically; Now an Hebrew and a Spaniſh Bible, differ more than numerically, becauſe they differ more than two Spaniſh or two Hebrew Bibles differ from one another*, and *yet theſe differ numerically the one from the other.*

1. Had the *Youngling Elder* diſputed thus, how many exclamations, of *poore man! illiterate ſoule! ſilly man!* &c. would your tender heart have beſtowed upon him; but I ſhall not retaliate, for the Reader (if intelligent) I am confident will ſpare me a labour. Things (you ſay) that differ *pluſquam numero, do differ ſpecie.* Should a freſh-man hear you reaſon thus. *Mas & fœmina differunt pluſquam numero, ergò differunt ſpecie*, or a *learned man* and *an ideot*, *differunt pluſquam numero ergo differunt ſpecie*, they would laugh at your argument; the very *boyes* would judge you a *profeſſor* fitter for an *alley* than an *Academye.* Do not you grant that theſe *differ ſpecie accidentali* onely; and will you conclude that therefore they differ *ſpecifically.*

2. You ſay, That *though the difference betweene* an *Hebrew Bible and a Spaniſh* is *but in ſpecie accidentali*, or *ſpecificall accidentall, yet ſuch a difference as this is ſufficient to prove that they differ numerically.* You give in already, and ſhew your ſelf but a founder'd diſputant, for what is this to your *undertaking*, which was to prove your *ſecond ſuppoſition, viz.* That they do differ *ſpecifically* and not *numerically* onely, which was nothing to the *ſecond ſuppoſition*, page 37.

3. You contend that a *Spaniſh* Bible, a *Latine*, and an *Engliſh*, differ *in ſpecie accidentali*, or with a difference ſpecifical accidentall in regard of the *ſpecifically different* Languages wherein they were *written. Ergo quid*, how by all this prove you your aſſertion, which was, that the *ſcriptures* in their *ſeverall Languages* do differ *ſpecifically*; nayhow prove you by the *ſpecifical accidental* difference of the *Bibles*, that the Scripture or the *foundation* is not the ſame numerically. The *Languages* I will grant differ *ſpecifically*, and the copies doe differ with a difference *ſpecificall accidentall*, but

the *Scripture* the *foundation of faith*, the will of God revealed *in writing*, is *numerically and identically the same*. May not the same thing *numerically* be the subject of *accidents specifically different*? The same man may (I speak not of *Master Goodwin*) speake *Latine*, *Greek*, and *Hebrew*. These *Languages differ specifically*, yet the man who speaks them, is not *multiplyed*, but is *numerically* the same. *Ahasuerus sent out a decree* to the people of an *hundred twenty and seven Provinces* in sevecall Languages, the *Decree* was *one numerically*, for he sent not out many but onely one Decree, though the Languages differed *specifically*, and the *Copies numerically*, and *specie accidentali*, in regard of the *specifically* different *Languages*; and why may not the same be said of the *foundation of Religion*. The *Bibles and Copies* wherein the *foundation* of *Religion* is contained differ *specifically accidentally*, in regard of their *specifically* different Languages, but the *foundation of Religion*, i. e. the *revelation* of the *will of God* in *writing* is *numerically one* and the *same*; so that your learned argument, That the Scriptures cannot be the foundation of Religion in severall Languages, because of the specificall or at least numericall difference of the *Bibles*, is vaine and childish.

Esth. 3.12.8,9.

We have seen your *acumen* in *arguing*, let us see what you can do in *answering* (so far as you go) of what you are pleased to *pick* out of *Busie Bishop*, against your opinion concerning the Scriptures.

You say *but very little* by way of answer; but in that little you *wofully trifle*; you stay not to answer the Scriptures I bring against you at all, nor do seriously indeavour *satisfaction* in any thing, onely you propound two or three *slight and impertinent quæries* against what I write, and so, as if you were lapping at *Nilus*, you hastily and superficially conclude.

Busie Bishop; *p.* 22.

I askt you in the *Busie Bishop*, how any could beleeve the *matter and substance of the Scriptures to be the Word of God, when as he must be uncertaine whether the written Word wherein the matter is contained, is the Word of God or no?*

Ia. Eld. p. 39. *&c.*

To this you answer by propounding these ignorant demands, whereof the first hath two branches.

1. *Is not this a question of the same profound calculation with this, how can a man beleeve the sun is a greater and the moone a lesser light if he be uncertaine whether every jot and tittle of what is read in*

our

our Bible, Gen. 1. 16. *be the Word of God or no? becauſe here it is ſaid, And God made two great lights, the greater, &c.*

2. And afterwards. *Do not the Scriptures affirme, That the heavens declare the glory of God, &c. and againe, That that which may be knowne of God, his inviſible things, his eternall power and Godhead, are clearely ſeene from the creation of the world; and that the Gentiles (without the written Word) ſhew the works of the Law written in their hearts?*

Anſw.

In this demand which you put under two diſtinct heads, you expreſſe two groſſe miſtakes, unworthy a *ſcholler*, though not unbeſeeming *your ſelf.*

1. In that you diſtinguiſh not betweene the matters of the Scripture to be beleeved, *i. e.* betweene thoſe things or objects which are *communia*, ſuch as may be knowne by the *light of nature*, and thoſe which are *propria*, ſuch as cannot be knowne but by the *Revelation* of the *written Word*; our queſtion was not concerning *winter and ſummer*, the greatneſſe of the *Sun and Moon*, &c. but concerning the *Myſteries of faith.*

For when you explaine your ſelf *Sion Coll. viſited, and Divine Auth. pag.* 17. what you meant by the *matter, ſubſtance, precious counſels of the Scripture*, did you make any mention of the ſun and moone, the winter and ſummer; did you not ſay you meant ſuch truths as theſe? *That Chriſt was God and man, That Chriſt dyed, That he aroſe againe, &c. Now can you know theſe without a written Word*, though you may the greatneſſe of the ſun above that of the Moone?

Your ſecond groſſe miſtake in propounding this demand, is, in that you diſtinguiſh not betweene an *intellectuall habit, knowledge, and a divine grace, faith*; the ground of the one being *reaſon*, the ground of the other being *divine teſtimony.* Or in that you diſtinguiſh not between *fides divina*, or *theologica*, and *fides naturalis & acquiſita*, acquired by humane reaſons, or by the authority of man; it was of the former that I diſputed, and now you learnedly (*ut ſoles*) fly to the latter. When you ſay, That without the *written Word* you can beleeve the greatneſſe of the Sun above that of the Moon, *Can you beleeve this with a divine faith, without a written Word? Quævis propoſitio phyſica, aſtrologica, hiſtorica fit objectum fidei, ſi à deo in Scripturis nobis propo-*

Scriptura, & fides noſtra ſunt æqualis latitudinis, fides nec plus nec minus debet ampleƈti quàm eſt in Scriptura revelatum. Gerh. Exeg. p. 169.

natur, Davenant, p. 12. *de judice fidei.* Then (ſaith he) *is any Phyſicall, Aſtrologicall, Hiſtoricall propoſition, the object of faith when it is propounded to us by God in the Scriptures*; and page 149. *Formalis ratio credendi, eſt authoritas dei revelantis.* You may alſo ſay, That without a *written Word* you beleeve that the *worlds were framed by God*, but can you beleeve this with a *divine faith*, unleſſe you had a *written word for it?* Theſe things haply you may know, and by a naturall or acquired faith, but not by a divine faith, beleeve, unleſſe written, *quod non lego, non credo.*

Your ſecond profound demand is: *If it be impoſſible for me to beleeve that the matter and ſubſtance of the Scripture is the Word of God, becauſe I am uncertaine whether the written Word be the word of God or no, how came the Patriarchs to beleeve it, who lived the firſt two thouſand yeeres of the world, ſince it was uncertaine to them whether the word ſhould ever be written? The ſame way to bring me to beleeve what they believed is open to the glorious God.*

Anſw. Thoſe things that the Patriarchs beleeved, they had from and by *divine revelation*, and though the *written word* was not needfull to them for the grounding their faith upon the things beleeved, God then *immediately manifeſting* himſelfe to them without it, as even now I told you, yet the like cannot be ſaid of us who live under a different diſpenſation. *Vid. Riv. Cath. Orth. T.* 1. *Q.* 1. *Whitak. Chamier, &c.*

This was the ſubſtance of your firſt argument, *Yo. Eld. p.* 32. I muſt ſend you back for anſwer: The ſame way to bring you to beleeve, may be open by Gods power, but it is not his pleaſure to open it.

3. You ſay, The *nature, beauty, worth, weight, &c.* of the *matters and ſubſtance of the Scripture is ſufficient to bring men to believe that they are things which came from God, though they had not the ſuper-added advantage of any thing in the Scripture as writing.*

Anſw. It was great pitty that you were not conſulted withall to give your judgement concerning the moſt *advantagious way* of bringing men to believe; why inſtead of inventing new *grounds of faith*, ſubmit you not *to the old?* Its no matter what ſuch a *poore creature* as your ſelf ſay, when you tell us what is the moſt ſufficient way to bring men to *beleeve*, when as I ſee that the

wiſe

wiſe God was pleaſed not onely to have the *matters* committed to *writing*, but alſo to tell us (notwithſtanding the *weight of the matter*) that the end of that *writing* was that men might beleeve thoſe *matters*, *Theſe things are written that ye might beleeve*, *Joh.* 21. and 1 *Jo.* 5. 13. why rather did not the *Evangeliſt* ſay, Theſe things are *ſo weighty*, ſo *worthy*, ſo *beautifull*, that therefore you have reaſon to beleeve them.

2. The moſt *weighty worthy* matter that ever was beleeved, had it onely been beleeved for its owne *weight* and *worth*, and not as *revealed* by God, and becauſe God *manifeſted* it, had not been beleeved with a divine faith. 'Tis not the *worth* of the thing but the *Authority* of the Speaker that is the ground of a mans *faith*: Nor doe I underſtand how the *worth and beauty* of any thing can be ſaid to bring men to beleeve that thing, they may indeed bring a man to *deſire* it, and to *long* to *enjoy* it; there's required to faith not *a worth and a beauty in the thing revealed*, but *truth in the revelation*; the object of aſſent is not *pulchrum*; but *verum*, not the *beauty* of the thing ſpoken, but the *veracity* of the ſpeaker. *Be the thing never ſo good, yet I beleeve not* (ſaith learned *Downame*) *unleſſe I be perſwaded it is true*, p. 355. Treat. of juſtification.

3. He that aſſents not to the Scriptures as *revealed by God*, cannot aſſent unto the *beauty* of the matters contained in the Scriptures. There's nothing revealed in the *Scripture* will ſeeme truly *beautifull* and worthy to that man that beleeves not the *authority* of the Revealer. If the *written word* be entertained, and received as (ſaith the apoſtle) as the word of man, the moſt beautifull and worthy *matters* in the Scripture will be ſo far from being *beleeved*, that they will be *profanely neglected*. When as the *excellenteſt matters* were preached to the *Jewes* by *Chriſt*, how were they contemned, in regard that they were not lookt upon as the minde of God, but rather on the contrary.

To conclude my Anſwer to this *profane conceit* of yours, ſhould this *beauty*, *worth*, *weight*, *&c.* of the matters contained in the *Scripture* be admitted as the *ground* of *beleeving* them, I would know by *what rule* we ſhould judge of this their *beauty*, *worth*, *weight*, *&c.* or what it is when their *beauty* is impugned by hereticks (as you know that the glorioully *beautifull truth* of

the *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt*, ſo beautifull that its *worthy of all acceptation*, is by *Socinus* accounted the moſt *deformed* and *unrighteous conceit* that can be. What is it (I ſay) in ſuch caſes by which I ſhould groundedly account the truth of God *beautifull*? you muſt here denying the *written Word*, make any mans judgement and reaſon to be *the rule of the beauty and worth of the matters of the Scriptures*, every one muſt eſteeme of truth, and believe them, as *reaſon* dictates and tels them they are *beautifull*, and then Mr. *Goodwins Socinian* deſigne is perfectly accompliſht. And there are who ſtick not to ſay, That all the *clamourous outcries* of your *tongue* and *pen* intend nothing but the advancing the *Diana* of *recta ratio* inſtead of *Scripture*.

To. Eld. p. 40. Yet againe you querie (though to no purpoſe, yet) to this effect: *Doth not* (ſay you) *the Scripture affirme that the* τὸ χρηστὸν, *the goodneſſe of God leadeth to repentance? Rom. 2. 4.* Which *repentance cannot be without beleeving of the matters of the Scripture, as that upon repentance God will be gracious and accept men into favour, and forgive their ſinnes; now this goodneſſe of God, leading to this repentance, is extended to many, who are uncertaine whether the written word be the Word of God or no.*

Anſw. 1. This is a paſſage of the ſame *prophane calculation* with that in *Divine Auth.* where you ſaid, That *the Heathens who only have the Heavens, the Sun, Moon, and Stars, to preach the Goſpell unto them, have reaſon ſufficient to judge the ſame judgement with them who have the Letter of the Goſpell.* Which in *Buſie Biſhop* was diſproved; to which in this booke you reply *nothing*, but now *braze* your face and ſay the ſame things againe.

pag. 182.

2. From this place *Rom. 2. 4.* that *Gods goodneſſe leads to repentance*, followes it that *Heathens* who onely were invited by the *generall goodneſſe* of God in the governing of the world, beleeved that God would be gracious unto them, and *forgive them their ſinnes in Chriſt the Mediator?* followes it that all *invitation* to *repentance* is invitation to a *Redeemer*, and to *beleeving*, and that rain from Heaven and fruitfull ſeaſons did afford ſuch an invitation? There's a *repentance* which is not *ſaving*, and *true* and *internall*, but *externa & diſciplinaris*, which conſiſteth in meere *abſtinence* from *outwardly vicious acts*, and in the *contrary practice* of actions *civilly and morally honeſt*. And 2. there's an invitation

Spanhem de grat. univerſ. pag. 1291.

to

to repentance, which is *ſimpliciter imperativa* and *exactiva officii*, (as *Spanhemius* ſaith) which *ſimply commands* and *exacts*, that duty which man owes to God, which requiring of repentance leads not more to a *Redeemer*, than the requiring of that debt did lead the ſervant in the Goſpell to a *ſurety*. And 3. how could the *Gentiles* be lead to *true and ſaving repentance* by the outward benefits they enjoyed, who thought that they received them from *Jupiter* and *Juno* and ſuch *Idols*, and that all that *repentance* which thoſe Idol-Deities required from them, did conſiſt in *idolatrous worſhips*, and ſacrifices and ſervices? Theſe of whom the Apoſtle ſpeakes, could not rightly think of God, who only could pardon them, nor of the duty of repentance they owed to this God without a *ſuperious illumination*, far excelling that which is by the *common goodneſſe* of God in the government of the world; you wofully blunder therefore in affirming that the heathens beleeved the matters of the Scripture being deſtitute of the written Word.

* *Nemo poteſt vel minimum guſtum rectæ ſanæq; doctrinæ percipere, niſi qui ſcripturæ fuerit diſcipulus. Palam eſt Deum ergo eos omnes quos unquam erudire cum fructu voluit, ſubſidium verbi adhibuiſſe quòd effigiem ſuam in mundi formâ impreſſam parum eſſe efficacem provideret. Significat propheta, Pſ. 19. quum frustra Deus omnes populos ad ſe invitet ea-li terræq; in tuitu, legem eſſe peculiarem filiorum Dei ſcholam. Cùm humana mens pro ſuâ inbecilitate pervenire ad Deum nullo modo queat, niſi ſacro ejus verbo adjuta & ſublevata omnes tunc mortales, exceptis judæis, quia Deum ſine verbo quærebant, neceſſe fuit in vanitate, atq; errore verſari.* Calv. Inſtit. c. 6. l. 1.

Briefly thus; you ſay, The *goodneſſe of God beſtowed upon the Gentiles who were deſtitute of the written word, led them to a true and ſound repentance, and to a knowledge, that upon that repentance God would be gracious unto them and forgive them their ſins*; I deſire in your next, your ſo frequently promiſed undertaking (if at leaſt we be not put off, as ever yet we have been, with a mouſe inſtead of a mountaine) you would tell us whether a *true and ſound* repentance and a knowledge that God will be *gracious* in the *forgiveneſſe of ſins*, were ever (yet) wrought in any without the knowledge of *Chriſt Jeſus*, and whether the *generall goodneſſe* of God put forth in the government of the world did ever manifeſt *Chriſt Jeſus to the Gentiles*; ſure I am the Apoſtle tels the Epheſians, *Eph.* 2. 12. That they *were formerly without Chriſt, having no hope, and without God in the world*; and the times wherein the *Gentiles* were deſtitute of the Goſpell are called the times of *ignorance*, to which he directly oppoſeth the time in which *now God commandeth all men every where to repent*, *Act.* 17. 30. I ſhall onely adviſe you to learn of reverend **Calvin*, Inſtit. l. 1. c. 6. No

man

man, saith he, *can have the least taste of sound Doctrine, but he that is taught by the Scripture.* And againe, *God hath bestowed upon all those whom he ever taught with benefit, the help of his Word, in regard that the effigies of himself imprinted upon the world, he foresaw could not be effectuall.* And again, *Quum frustra Deus*, &c. *Since God did* ineffectually *invite to himself all people by the sight of the Heaven and Earth, the Law is the peculiar schoole of his sons.* Once more heare that excellent man, *Since the minde of man, in regard of its weaknesse, could no wayes come unto God, unlesse helped and relieved by his holy Word, all men who sought God without his Word, were necessarily occupied in vanity and errour: The Gentiles could not have beleeved this proposition* (saith *Davenant*) *Christ hath reconciled us to God by his death, unlesse it had been revealed to them by the preaching of the Apostles.*

Gentes huic propositioni, Christus morte suâ nos reconciliavit Deo, non potuerunt fidem adhibere nisi ea per prædicationem Apostolorum fuisset illis revelata, p. 149 de jud. & nor. fid.

To conclude this first question, I desire the Reader to observe that this *Dotard*, who would be accounted the great assertor of the *Divine Authority* of the Scriptures, doth when he states the question borrow of the Papists their blasphemies, cals the *Written Word ink and paper*, as *Eccbius*, *Pighius*, and others; and when he *disputes* against the Scriptures, he goeth downe to these *Philistims* to *sharpen his axe*, and is beholding to *Papists and Jesuites* for most of his arguments. This the Reader may see in this brief parallel which I have added with an intimation of some *learned Protestants* who have confuted them; that he may not say in his next, It is no matter whose the argument is, but who hath answered it?

Master Goodwin.	*The Papists agreeing with him.*	Protest. Writers confuting them both.
YO. *Eld. p.* 32. *Arg.* 1. Religion was founded, built, stood firme and stable in the world before the Scriptures were, *Div. Auth. pag.* 10. *Moses* is generally acknowledged by us to be the first pen-man of the	BEllarminus de verbo Dei, l. 4. c. 4. *Ab Adam usq; ad Mosen, fuit Ecclesia dei aliqua in mundo, & colebant homines deum fide, &c. at nulla fuit scriptura ante Mosen.* There was a Church in the world from *Adam* to	*Chamierius Panstr. t.* 1. *l.* 7. *c.* 7. *Rivet. Cath. or. Trac.* 1. *q.* 1.

Master Goodwin.	*The Papists agreeing with him.*	Protest. Writers confuting them both.
Scriptures, or the Word of God, and that the world had continued more than 2000 yeeres before he was borne; but to affirme that there was no word of God in the world, no foundation of Religion, for the space of 2000 yeers is to contradict what is plainly written.	to *Moses*, and men worshipped God, but there was no Scripture before *Moses*, &c. *Vid. etiam Bailium. Jesuitam in sua catechesi, Ecc. Enchirid T. 2. Trip. Cord.* p. 156 before *Moses* who first wrote, the Church continued 2000 yeeres. *Fuit assensus fidei antequam esset Scriptura, Turnb. Tetrag.*	*Gerrard Exeg. pag. 16. Whitak de Script.*
Town. Eld. page 31. if the Scriptures be the only foundation in point of manifestation, how came all the pen-men of the Scriptures, by the knowledge they had of God, and of Christ, and of Religion, did they ground their knowledge of these upon the Scriptures, whilest as yet they were not.	1 *Turnbul Jesuita Tetrag. c.* 10. *Ipsi scriptores canonici prius fuerunt divinitus edocti i scribenda, quàm scriberent alioque proinde signo Deum fuisse dictatorem scribendorum.* The pen-men of the Scriptures, were taught by God the things that were to be wrote before they wrote them, and therefore by some other signe than the written Word, God did dictate to them what they were to write.	*Baronius Apol. pr. object. formali fidei tr. 4. p.* 155.
To. Eld. p. 33. *Arg.* 2. All bookes whatsoever are perishable, may be burnt, miscarry by many casualties, *Argu.* 5.	*Jac. Tiri. Jes. Syn. Contr. ex ser. Textum bibliorum hebraicum non paucis in locis depravatum esse, partim injuria temporum, par-*	

Master Goodwin.

It is very possible, that either through negligence ignorance, of Scribes, and correctors of the presse, some such errour may be found in every copy now extant in the world, which will render this Copy contradictious to it self. *Arg.* 7. Experience teacheth us that the Books and Bibles themselves, are *de facto*, altered by men from time to time.

Arg. 8. If Mr. *Jenkin* will say, That the Scriptures are the foundation of Religion, only as they are in the Originals, then they who understand not these languages, cannot build (at least with understanding) upon this foundation, and consequently can never bee truly religious, *Divine Auth.* pag. 19.

=

I suppose it is no foun-

Papists agreeing with him.

tim insciti vel ossitantia typograph orum, &c. suis hinc inde locis ostendi.

The Hebrew Text of the Bibles are corrupted and depraved, partly by the injury of times, partly by the ignorance and idlenesse of printers, &c. *vid. etiam Stapleton. Relect. princ. fid. doct. contr.* 5. *q.* 3. *act.* 1. 2. *valent. in Thom. Tom.* 3. *Disp.* 1. *q.* 1.

Turnbul. Tetrag. c 5. *sect.* 2. *Scriptura immediatè spectata, est idonea tantum regula literatis nec usui esse potest illiteratis, &c.* The Scripture considered immediately, is onely a fit rule to men learned, nor can it be of any use to the illiterate. So *Canus in Locis, l.* 2. *c.* 13. *Discourse concerning the rule of faith, sect.* 7. Scriptures cannot bee a rule of faith, accomodate to the capacities of unlearned men who cannot read them.

Discourse ubi supr. sec. 6. These

Protest. Writers confuting them both.

Maresius theol. elench. T. 1 *p.* 24.

Sol. Glass. T. 1. *de pur. Text.*

Chamierius Paustr. T. 1. *l.* 12. *c.* 10.

Baron. Apol. Tr. 1. *c.* 2.

Dr. White way to the Ch. p. 17.

Master Goodwin.	*Papists agreeing with him.*	Protest. Writers confuting them both.
dation of faith to believe that the English Scriptures are the word of God; God spake not to his Prophess or Apostles in English, nor doth our English Translation agree in all things with the true sence and meaning of the Originals, *Hagiom. pag.* 37. *sect.* 28.	These Translations are not infallible as the rule must be, for neither were the Scriptures written in this Language, neither were the Translators assisted by the same spirit infallibly, as if it were impossible they should erre, &c.	*Dr. Whites way to the Church, p.* 13.

I shall conclude with observing, that in this Mr. *Goodwin* is worse than either Papists, Enthusiasts, or such other Sectaries that oppose the written Word, because though they deny it to be the formall object of faith, or that upon which we are to ground and build our faith in beleeving the matters of the Scriptures, yet they have held forth some other foundation in stead of the written Word, but never were we beholding to Master *Goodwin* for such a favour.

This Bishop of *Bangor* vainly threatned when he entred upon the handling of this question about the Scriptures, that he would make his *friend William as heretical as himselfe before they parted at this turning*: My Lord, we are now *parting at this turning*; but all that your *young friend* hath received at your *Lordships hands* is *confirmation* in the same truth which he entertained before you and he first met, and which so much opposeth your Errours; and he hopes that he shall ever *forsake you and these your workes*. *Yo. Eld. p.* 26.

CHAP. IIII.

Shewing the weakneſſe and erroneouſneſſe of Maſter Goodwins *pretended Anſwers to what I bring againſt his Errours about the power of man to good ſupernaturall.*

IN my former Booke called *Euſie Biſhop*, I charged you with *Arminianiſm* in the handling this Doctrine of *grace and free will*; you deny not the charge but acknowledge it true, though not *penitentially*, but *impudently*: But what ſay you in your owne defence?

To. El p. 43, 44. Sect. 56.

1. You ſlight the charge, as fit to be regarded onely by *women and children, and not by men of worth, parts, &c.*

To. Eld. p. 43.

Anſw. But is it ſo ſmall a matter to be accounted, nay, to *be* a profeſt *Arminian*? would it never have moved men of *worth, parts, &c.* Were they men of no *worth* or *parts, &c.* that cenſured the Tenets in *Pelagius*, which afterward revived in *Arminius*? have none but *women and children* held theſe forth as *accurſed, abominable, moſt pernitious hereſies, execrable, peſtilent impieties*, the *poyſon and bane of faith*? The many holy and learned men who have been moved againſt the errours of *Arminius*, were ſo far from being children for their deep reſentment of this hereſie, that they ſhew you a childe for ſleighting the charge of it; Neither *women* nor *children* ſit in Parliament, and yet the *Houſe of Commons* in their *Remonſtrance* to the *King, June* 11. 1628. profeſſe themſelves no leſſe perplexed with the growth of *Arminianiſm* than of *Popery*; that being a cunning way to bring in *Popery*; and the profeſſors of *Arminianiſm* they looke upon as the *common diſturbers* of Proteſtant Churches, and *Incendiaries* of thoſe States wherein they have gotten head, being *Proteſtants* in ſhew, but *Jeſuites* in opinion and practice; Its cleare what Maſter *Goodwins* eſteeme was of *that Parliament*, for being ſo *moved* againſt *Arminians*; and I doubt not but this *preſent Parliament* which hath been ſo earneſt in ſuppreſſing *Arminians*, is yet lower in the opinion of this cenſor.

Conc. Carth. 3 ſub Aurel. Apud Bin. To. 1. p. 864. Conc. Mileu. 868, 869. Nefarius & ab omnibus anathematizandus error. hæreſis nimium periculoſa, error perniciоſiſſimus. Aug. ad Hilar. ep. 94. peſtifera impietas execrabile dogma. Id. fidei venena Aug. Contr. Julian.

Vid. Prin. neceſſ. Introd p. 92.

2. In

2. In this ſection you plead *that truth is not the worſe becauſe hæreticks hold it, I my ſelf (you ſay) hold ſome things that Devills, Phariſees, Arminians beleeve.* *To. Eld. p. 44.*

Its confeſt, but this comes not up to your caſe; If you hold any truth which the *Arminians* hold, I blame you not; Its for the embracing the errours which they maintaine that I charge you. Its a ſpeech of *Auguſtine* to the Sectaries. *That there is free will in man, we ſay on both ſides, hence therefore it is not that you are called Celeſtians, but that any one hath free will to good, you ſay, and hence you are called Celeſtians*; you tell me that *the devill holds Jeſus Chriſt to be the holy one of God*; but this confeſſion makes him not a devill, its common with the Church of *Chriſt*; but your tenets are properly *Pelagian, Arminian,* condemned by the Churches of Chriſt, whom you leave therefore, particularly this Church of *England*, of which the learned *Davenant* ſaith: *No man can embrace Arminianiſm, in the Doctrine of predeſtination* and *grace*, but he muſt firſt deſert the *Articles* agreed upon by the *Church* of *England*. And in this you cloſe with the *Jeſuite*, building upon that *foundation* which *he* laid, and watering that *plant* which he planted in *England* and *Holland*, as a *ſoveraigne drugg* to purge the *Proteſtants* from their *hereſie*. *Anſw.* *L. de nup. & Conc. c. 3. Liberum in homine eſſe arbitrium, utriq; dicimus, hinc non eſtis Celeſtiani liberum autem quenquam eſſe ad faciendum bonum, hec vos dicitis, hinc eſtis celeſtiani.* *Prin. Comp. Tr. p. 166.*

3. You ſay, That *this practice of mine to defame books, by ſaying that thoſe who are erroneous hold them, is an old device of Papiſts, whereby they endeavour to render ſuch truths of God as made not for their intereſts hateſull*, you inſtance in one *Prateolus*. *To. Eld p. 44.*

A triviall paſſage that needs not a reply. *Papiſts* ſlander *truths*, I diſcover'd *errours*; where's the *harmony*? They load *truths* with imputation of *errour*, I compare *errour* with *errour*. When you ſhall have cleered your ſelf and opinion from the *imputation of Arminianiſm*, as *Morton, Springlius, Rivet*, have vindicated the Proteſtants againſt *Prateolus* and his compeers, you may ſay I uſed a *popiſh ſtratagem*, but till then you muſt be under the accuſation of *hereſie, for ought I can do to relieve you*. *Anſw.* *Morton Cath. Apo. par. 1. c. 24 Spr. de hæreſ. p. 1. l. 2, 3. Riv. Cath. Orth. Tr. 1.*

I having told the Reader that your charging the Subſcribers of the Teſtimony with *Manicheiſm* is as old as *Pelagius*, and by him caſt upon *Jerome* and *Auſtin*; *This*, you ſay, *is as if one charged for a ſeducer of the people, ſhould plead thus for himſelfe, The accuſation of ſeducing the people was caſt upon Chriſt by the Phariſees, &c.* *To. Eld. p. 45. ſect. 57.*

ſees, &c. by whom have any of your judgement in the point of reprobation, been vindicated from the accuſation of Manicheiſm.

Anſw. 1. I do indeed tell the Reader, That this *charge of Manicheiſm* is as old as *Pelagius*, that he may obſerve your *complyance* with that *Heretick*, as in your opinions, ſo in your *opprobrious calumnies* againſt the truth; you know who ſaid it.

Non eſt mirum ſicut novi hæretici, catholicis à quibus exeunt, novum nomen imponant, Aug. l. 2. op. imp. n. 7.

Nec lacte lacti, nec ovum ovo ſimilius.
'Twixt milk and milk the likeneſſe is not greater,
Nor egge to egge more parallel in feature.

2. A *ſeducer* (ſuch are you) may not plead for himſelfe, by ſaying the *Phariſees* did caſt the accuſation of *ſeducing* upon *Chriſt*, but *an innocent perſon* may beare up his ſpirit with the recollection to his minde, of the *falſe accuſations* that have been caſt upon *the ſaints* in former ages. *So perſecuted they the Prophets*, ſaith *Chriſt*, *Mat.* 5: 12. And (as *Auſtine* ſaith) though it be a *dangerous thing to reproach ſuch, yet is it a glorious thing to ſuffer reproaches with ſuch.*

Cernis cum quibus maledicta tua ſuſtineam, cernis cum quibus mihi ſit cauſa communis, cernis quam tibi pernitioſum ſit, tam horribile crimen objicere talibus, & quam mihi glorioſum ſit quod libet crimen audire & talibus. Aug. Contr. Jul. l. 1. c. 4.

3. You aſk by whom any of my judgement in the point of reprobation, have been vindicated from *Manicheiſm*.

1. How know you my judgement in the point of *reprobation*. 2. What need any of *my judgement* in the point of *reprobation*, any *vindication* from *Manicheiſm*? doth not this further manifeſt, that you underſtand not what *Manicheiſm* is? Did the *Manichees* hold any *reprobation* at all? You lay upon me the imputation of *Manicheiſm*; I deny it. 'Tis your part to *prove* it, who *ſay* it; but do it throughly leaſt you prove your ſelf not onely a *ſimple accuſer*, but a *falſe accuſer*. But 3 know that if thoſe whoſe hereſie is your inheritance, have caſt the imputation of *Manicheiſm* upon any of my judgement, they have been ſufficiently cleared by *Auguſtine* of old, and by *Springlius*, cited *Buſie Biſhop*, page 48. among many Moderne Writers who have done the like.

Yo. Eid. p. 45. Sect. 58. In this ſection I finde you *miſerably flundering in the quagmires of errour, non-ſence, and abſurdity*; and you would faine perſwade Maſter *Ball* to ſinke with you, but you cannot; your opinion is this: *Men are not wholly deſtitute of all power to do what God requires of them as ſimply neceſſary to ſalvation, particularly to repent, and beleeve.* Maſter *Balls* worde are theſe: *No man is hindered from*

from beleeving through the difficulty or unreasonableneſſe of the command, or through his owne ſimple infirmity, as being willing to beleeve but not able, which inability deſerves pitty, but he doth not beleeve becauſe he will not.

1. I demanded, *what is here that gives you the leaſt countenance in your errours?* You anſwer by asking, *Who either ſaid or thought that here was any thing of ſuch import?* I reply, If *you* did not think ſo, you dealt very contraconſcientiouſly to ſay ſo. Your very words, *Sion Coll. viſited, pag.* 16. are theſe: *The ſelf-ſame opinions* are countenanced *by men of your owne party for which you defame others*, and immediately you ſubjoyne this allegation out of Maſter *Ball*. And *Youngling Elder, pag.* 46. ſay you not thus: *I cite the words not ſo much by way of* countenance *as concurrence*. Here's an open *confeſſion* that you cite the words by way of *countenance* as well as concurrence, though not by way of *countenance* ſo much; but you would faine be lookt upon as a *Doctor ſeraphicus, irrefragabilis, reſolutus*, (the encomiums of three dunces met in one,) your opinions need no mans *countenance*, nay, *you build your faith no more upon the Scripture, than Chriſt his upon Moſes*. You call me *childling* for but *asking what is here that gives you countenance*. But friend, though you be haply a *Pythagorus to your deluded followers*, you need ſome *countenance* to beare up your port among others. And its juſt with God if you who have accuſtomed your ſelf ſo much to falſneſſe ſhould not hereafter be beleeved by plaine hearted Chriſtians, without the *Countenance* of others, though poſſibly you ſpeake the truth; Its the portion of the *lyar*.

To. Eld. p. 45. *Anſw.* *To. Eld. p.* 31. *To. Eld. p.* 46.

2. You proceed, *Maſter Ball (ſaith Maſter Jenkin) ſaith, That unwillingneſſe to beleeve hinders a man from beleeving, but he doth not ſay, that any man of himſelfe can be willing. But, Maſter Jenkin, when I tell you that Maſter Ball ſpeakes of apples, why do you (by way of anſwer) tell me that he doth not ſpeak of oyſters; where did Maſter Jenkin ever meet with any ſuch aſſertion of mine? who ever ſaid that any man of himſelfe could be willing to beleeve?*

To. Eld. p. 46

I perceive your minde is on your junkets, you had rather be *loading the aſſe* than *diſputing*. But (Maſter *Goodwin*) if you cited Maſter *Ball* by way of *concurrence* with you, why do you bring him in ſpeaking *of apples*, when you ſpeake *of oyſters*?

if

if the serious Reader compare your words and Master *Balls*, should he finde them to agree, 'twill be with the agreement of *harp and harrow*.

Yo. El. p. 51. 2. Did never any man say, That a man of himself could be willing *to beleeve?* why then you have wronged *Pelagius* in the 51. page of *Youngling Elder*, charging him to have held, *That the adjutory of grace was not simply necessary for the enabling of the will to do that which is pleasing to God, but by way of accommodation or facilitation of the worke*, citing sundry places out of *Austine* to prove that this was his opinion, as indeed at first it was. Why abuse you poore *Pelagius* if he never said so?

Yo Eld. p. 45. sect. 58. 3. Did I never meet with such an opinion *of yours* as this, That *man of himselfe can be willing to beleeve?* you either forget or understand not your self. Say you not in this very section that your opinion is, *That men are not wholly destitute of all power to do what God requires of them, as simply necessary to salvation, particularly to repent and beleeve?* Also expresse you not your self thus in this section; *Naturall men want no power, no not of being willing, or* making themselves *willing to beleeve?* Say you not, That *men cannot be said to act or do, or to be able to act or do, but onely what is possible for them to will, or to* make themselves *willing to do?* This is your detestable Doctrine. Reader, are there not *two* who hold, *that man of himselfe can be able to beleeve?*

Yo. Eld. p. 47.

3. In this section you endeavour with wofull weaknesse to draw the forecited place of Master *Ball* to concurre with this your opinion. Thus Master *Ball* saith, *No man is hindered from beleeving through the difficulty or unreasonablenesse of the command.* Hence you infer, *Certainly a man hath power to do that, from the doing whereof he is not hindered by any difficulty relating to the performance of it. If the command of God, wherein he commands men to beleeve, hath no such difficulty in it whereby they are hindered from obeying it, have not men power to obey it, and consequently to beleeve?*

Answ. What *dotard* besides *J. G.* would have made *such* an inference; Master *Ball removes difficulty and unreasonableneſſe* from the *Command*, Master *Goodwin* simply all difficulty relating to the *performance*; Master *Ball* saith, No man is hindered from beleeving through the difficulty of the *Command*; Therefore saith Master *Goodwin*, men have power to obey it. But friend, be mercifull

merciſull to the ſepulchre of a *Saint* now in *heaven*. How little did this bleſſed man thinke when he was on earth, that ever *Popery* and *Arminianiſme* ſhould have found a *prop* in his writings after his diſceaſe; *Popery* I ſay, for might you not as well have argued from Maſter *Balls* words, that men want no power to keep the *whole Law?* for, is it from the difficulty or unreaſonableneſſe of the Law that men performe not the Law, or from the weakneſſe and corruption of their nature? pray, paſſe not ſentence upon Mr. *Ball* before you heare what he can ſay for himſelfe, p. 245. *Cout. of Gr.* he ſaith, *Impoſſible in it ſelfe*, or in reſpect of the *unreaſonableneſſe of the thing commanded is not the object of Gods Commandment, but an impoſſible thing to us may be and is the object of Gods Commandment*; ſhould I requeſt Mr. *Goodwin* to conſtrue a chapter in the *Hebrew Bible*, he would not be hindered from doing it by any difficulty in the *thing* which I requeſt of him, but if he underſtands not the *Hebrew Tongue*, he would be hindered through *his owne unskilfulneſſe*; if there be no impoſſibility on the part of the *command*, yet if there be an impoſſibility on the part of the *commanded*, there will be a falling ſhort of *performance*.

4 You adde beſides, *when Mr. Ball* ſaith, *A man doth not beleeve becauſe he will not, he doth not reſolve his unbeleefe into any deficiency of power in him to will, or to make himſelfe willing* (*as Mr.* Jenkin *would imply*) *but into his will it ſelfe, into the actuall and preſent frowardneſſe; and indiſpoſition of his will*; therefore what? why therefore (according to the Gloſſe of Maſter *Goodwin*) Mr. *Ball* aſſerts, a *man hath power to beleeve*.

Anſw. If *impudence* in an old man be a vertue, you are vertuous; you ſhamefully abuſe Mr. *Ball*, for he reſolves not mans unbeliefe into a *preſent* and *actuall wilfulneſſe*, or frowardneſſe of his will, as if the will had a *ſtrength* and *power* to beleeve, but being in a *fit of peeviſhneſſe*, would not put forth that power, or make uſe of that ſtrength though it could doe ſo if it pleaſed; but he reſolves mans unbeliefe into a frowardneſſe, not, *actuall and preſent*, but *habituall and rooted, and ſetled*, ſuch a *frowardneſſe and oppoſitenеſſe to the things of God, as that he cannot but be froward and oppoſite till the Lord makes him to conſent; habituall frowardnes in mans will being the root of the wils impotency*, and that

this holy man reſolves unbeliefe into *this habituall frowardneſſe*, is cleare from the ſcope of this place, which is to prove, that *God is juſt in requiring faith, though he gives not ſufficient grace to men to beleeve if they will*, and from the conſtant conſent of other paſſages in this and his other books. Heare what he ſaith concerning the production of faith; *God* (ſaith he) *doth infuſe or poure the habit of faith into man, whereby he giveth to will to come to Chriſt; this is requiſite to faith, for as a dead man can doe no act of life untill a living ſoule be breathed into him, &c. no more can man dead in treſpaſſes and ſins move himſelfe to receive the promiſes of grace, untill the free and gracious habit of faith be infuſed. We cannot will to beleeve unleſſe God give that will; the power to beleeve, and will to uſe that power is of God. It is God only and altogether that inableth, ſtirreth up, and inclineth the heart to beleeve.* If God have not left you to a moſt obſtinate obduration of heart, you will in your next acknowledge how you have abuſed Mr. *Ball*, in your ſaying that he doth reſolve mans unbeleefe only into *preſent, actuall frowardneſſe, or a fit of peeviſhneſſe*.

Tract of faith, pag. 11.

pag. 12.

To. Eld. p. 45. Sect. 59. You give us a fifty ninth Section thus: *juſt ſuch worke as he makes in interpreting Mr.* Balls *words, to manifeſt their non-concurrence with me, he makes alſo in a like attempt upon the paſſages cited by me from Mr.* Bucer, *the fathers*, Auſtine, Hierom.

Anſw. In this Section you plainly yeeld me, *Bucer*, *Auſtine*, and *Hierome*, acknowledging, that I have proved their *non-concurrence* with you, as I have proved the *non-concurrence* of Mr. *Ball* with you; if you deſire the Reader ſhould beleeve that *Bucer* and the *Fathers* are ſtill on your ſide, notwithſtanding all that I have ſaid to the contrary, why give you not ſo much as one word by way of taking off my *exceptions*, to your allegations out of them, which exceptions were largely ſet downe in my *Buſie Biſhop*, p. 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, &c. but all that I ſay in all theſe pages in proving the *impertinency* of your quotations out of the fore-cited *Authors*, you blow away with this learned anſwer; *juſt ſuch worke as he makes in manifeſting the non-concurrence of Mr.* Ball *with me, he makes alſo in a like attempt upon the paſſages cited by me from Mr.* Bucer *and the Fathers*; moſt ſtrenuouſly and diſputant-like illuſtrating, if not endeavouring

vouring to prove this your anſwer from the example of *Joſuah*, (quoted in chapter and verſe in your margin) who as he had done to *Hebron and Libnah, and to her King, ſo he did to Debir and her King*; and I promiſe you a good proofe too, as proofes goe now a dayes in the alley.

But what is become of your friend *Teſtard*, your *chiefe witneſſe*, whom alſo you alledged as *concurring* with you, *whoſe Doctrine* you (impudently) ſaid, *was aſſerted for orthodox by a province of Miniſters in France, and was the receaved Doctrine of the reformed Churches in France.* It had been ingenuity in this Reply to have asked pardon of that *Province*, which in your laſt you ſo *unworthily ſlandered?*

In your ſixtieth Section I reade thus. *Whereas he quotes ſeverall ſentences out of Mr.* Ball, Bucer, Auſtine, &c. *of a contrary import* (*as he after his weake manner imagines*) *to that opinion which I affirme to be aſſerted by them in the paſſages cited by me, I would gladly know of him what is the diſtinct ſound that this trumpet makes; my intent and driſt in citing theſe Authors was not to prove, or ſo much as to inſinuate, that they no where elſe in their writings delivered themſelves with any ſeeming contrariety to the places cited by me.* Ten. Eld. Sect. 60.

1. Whether it be more *weakneſſe* in me to *quote* places out of them, and alſo to prove the repugnancy of thoſe places to the errors which you hold forth, or in you not to *anſwer* the *quotations*, let my very enemies judge; if I cited thoſe paſſages *pertinently*, why tax you me with *weakneſſe?* if *weakly*, they had been the *ſooner anſwered.*

2. Whereas you aske why I cited them, I anſwer; the *tendency* of my *counter-quotations* was, to vindicate thoſe *godly, and orthodox* Authors from your *aſperſions*, to manifeſt how much you abuſed the truth and them, by holding them forth as favourers of your hereſies, and how farre they were from affording you ſuccour in your ſinne; and to let the Reader ſee what little credit is to be given to you when you cite Authors, and this was the intention both *operis* and *operantis.*

3. *Your intent* (you ſay) *in citing theſe Authors was not to inſinuate, that they no where elſe delivered themſelves in contrariety to the placeee cited by me,* &c. But its evident that you laid theſe

few paſſages taken out of *Bucer* and the *Fathers* upon the *ſtall*, in open view, to make every Reader thinke that the Books of thoſe eminent writers were ſhops that contained ſuch commodities within. Was it not your deſire to have the Reader beleeve, that the *conſtant tenor and ſtraine* of the writings of the cited Authors maintained your errours? elſe what is the meaning of that paſſage of yours, *Sion Colledge viſited p.* 17. where you having abuſed Mr. *Ball* in citing a paſſage out of him; you tell the Reader, *This paſſage fell not from the Authors pen at unawares, but the contents of it were his ſetled and well reſolved judgement*; to which end you produce *another* paſſage out of the ſame Author, which alſo you pretend to ſpeake for you.

I paſſe over your 61. and 62. Sections, wherein you pretend to nothing but *chaffe and ſcoffes*, my drift being to follow you only where you would be thought to write about the controverſie.

Yo. Eld. p. 50. Sect. 63. To the next therefore I having told you, *Buſie Biſh. p.* 48. that the great queſtion between *Jerome*, *Auſtine*, and *Pelagius*, was not whether the will did ſtand in need of *an adjutory of grace* for the performance of good, but what kind of adjutory it was; whether or no an *adjutory* by way of working of good in the will, and that *invincibly and indeclinably*, &c.

1. You tell the Reader that I ſaid, that *this was* the *queſtion*, but why pilfer you from my words? why clip you--- why leave you out the word great? I ſaid it was the great queſtion, had you put in that, you had found nothing to reply in this place; the ſtate of the queſtion changed foure times between *Auguſtine* and *Pelagius*, *as you may ſee* collected by *Aluar. de auxil. Lib.* 1. *c.* 2. by *Janſenius* in his *Auguſtinus*, *To.* 1. *l.* 5. by *Latins*, and *Voſſius* in *Hiſtoria Pelagianâ*.

1. At the firſt *Pelagius* deny'd *omne auxilium ſupernaturale*, all ſupernaturall aſſiſtance, and affirmed, that the *naturall power* of mans free will was ſufficient to keep all the Commandments, and to obtaine ſalvation.

2. He did acknowledge an *adjutory of grace*, but placed it in the *outward Doctrine of the Law*, and in the *example of Chriſt*, but denyed this to be *ſimply neceſſary*, but only for the *facilitation* of the act.

3. He

3. He confeſſed *an adjutory* by *inward grace*, viz. the *inward illumination* of the *underſtanding*, and the *excitation of the ſtupid will*, but alwayes denyed *that grace*, by which God works in us to will *infallibly*.

4. His ſchollar *Celeſtius* did confeſſe that *inward grace* was *ſimply* neceſſary, not to *begin*, but to *perfect* that which was good.

Now my aſſerting that the great queſtion between the *Fathers* and *Pelagius* was, what kind of *adjutory* it was of which the will did ſtand in need, is ſo farre from denying that there was any other queſtion, that it clearly implyes there were other.

2. You indeavour in this Section to evince, that this which I have mentioned was *not* the ſtate of the queſtion, for (ſay you) that which cauſed the diſtance between *Auſtin* and *Pelagius* was, that *Pelagius denyed the neceſſity of the adjutory of grace for the performance of the Law*, and this you pretend to prove from *Auſtins* words: *dicat Pelagius per gratiam nos poſſe præſtare legem Dei & pax eſt.* Let *Pelagius ſay that by grace we may performe the Law of God, and it is Peace.* *Yo. Eld. p. 50.*

But 1. Why have you ſo *learnedly* paſſed by all the places quoted out of *Auſtin* in *Bu. Biſh.* to prove, *i.e.* that *Pelagius* did acknowledge the neceſſity of the *help of God* to the *doing of good*; as where he ſaith, *we ſo praiſe nature, as that we alwayes adde the helpe of the grace of God*; *and where he pronounceth anathema againſt every one that thinketh the grace of God is not neceſſary every houre to every act.* 2. Why have you paſſed by all the places brought to prove that *Auſtin* was *not ſatisfied* with this *Conceſſion* of *Pelagius*, but ſaith, that *Pelagius* is to be asked what grace he meaneth? *& Lib. 1. c. 24. de grâ. Chriſti. Fateamur, &c. Let them confeſſe that there are wrought by a wonderfull, internal, and ineffable power, good wills in the heart as well as true diſcoveries*; *& Aug. de gr. et. l. a l. 16. Deus facit ut velimus, faciamus &c. God makes us will and doe by affording moſt efficacious ſtrength to the will. Hæc gratia à nullo, &c. this grace is rejected by no hard heart,* Bu. Biſh. p. 49 *Liberum ſic confitemur arbitrium ut dicamus nos ſemper indigere dei auxilio, Au. con. Pel. l. 1. c. 31. Its homanis laudamus naturam ut dei ſemper gratiam adlamus auxilium. Anathema qui docet grattam dei per ſingulos actus noſtros non eſſe neceſſariam.* Ibid. *Diligenter interrogandus eſt Pelagius quam dicat gratiam quâ fateamur homines adjuvari, quærimus quo auxilio, &c. Conr. Pel. & Cal l. 1. c. 31. fateamur internâ ineffabili poteſtate operari in cordibus hominum, non ſolum veras revelationes, ſed bonas voluntates, l. 1. c. 24. de gra. Deus facit ut velimus præbendo vires efficaciſſimas voluntati, de g. & l. c. 16.*

And *de cor. et. gra. C.* 12. *Infirmis ſervavit, &c. He reſerved for thoſe that were weake, that they ſhould by his gift will what is good, moſt invincibly, &c.* And whereas you ſay that *the words of Auſtin are expreſly contrary to this my information*, he ſaying, *Dicat Pelagius &c. Let Pelagius ſay that by grace we may performe the law of God, and we are friends*; you ſhew your ſelfe a vaine man thus *to boaſt of a ſentence you miſunderſtand*; *Aug.* (tis true) *deſired only that Pelagius would acknowledge* that a man did ſtand in need of the grace of God. But what *grace* meaneth he? *a grace morally ſuaſory, a grace only exciting*, that leaves the will to its owne *indifferency* to be ſaved *if it will*, that woos only, and doth not work, in a word, *Biſhop Goodwins Grace*; Impudent ſoul once to imagine it, and thus to fly-blow the *Fathers*! But to evince that *Auſtin* did not only require from *Pelagius* the acknowledgement of the neceſſity of *grace as an adjutory*, but *as this kind of adjutory* which I contend for, I adde to the former, theſe allegations out of *Auguſtin. de Grâ. Chriſti c.* 10. He thus tells you *what grace it is that he would have Pelagius acknowledge*, before ever he would *be friends with him*, *Pelagius* only acknowledging the *grace* that *inlightned* the *underſtanding*, and *excited* the ſtupid will (my Lords grace) *Auguſtin* excellently ſaith as followes. *Nos iſtam gratiam nolumus, iſtam aliquando gratiam fateatur, &c. We will not have ſuch a grace as he brings. Let Pelagius acknowledge that grace, whereby the greatneſſe of future glory is not only promiſed, but beleeved, and wiſdom not only revealed but beloved, & we not only intreated but prevaild with to accept of good, this grace muſt Pelagius ackdowledge, if he will not only be cald but be a Chriſtian.* It was a *grace* that *workes* the goodneſſe of the will *in us*, which gives to the ſoule a kind of *ſpirituall and divine being*, a *grace* that firſt, *bonam voluntatem operatur*, and then *per eam operatur*, *firſt workes a good will*, *and then by a good will. Auguſtin* ſaith, *God ſo hath our hearts in his power, that the good which we lay hold upon with our will, we lay not hold upon, unleſſe God worke the will.* And elſewhere, *Cum Deus*

Nos iſtam gratiam nolumus, iſtam aliquando gratiam fateatur, qua futuræ gloriæ magnitudo non ſolum promittitur verum etiam creditur & ſperatur, nec ſolum revelatur ſapientia, ſed & amatur nec ſuadetur ſolum omne quod bonum eſt, ſed & perſuadetur. Hanc debet Pelagius gratiam confiteri, ſi vult non ſolum vocari, verum etiam eſſe Chriſtianus. Hug de ſacr. l. 1. p. 6. c. 17. Aug. de bo. perſ. c. 23. Deus ſic in poteſtate ſua habet cor noſtrum ut bo wn quod non tenemus niſi propriâ voluntate, non tamen teneamus niſi ipſe in nobis operetur & velle. Aug. de præd. ſa. l. 1. c. 20. Cum Deus vult id fieri, quod non niſi volentibus hominibus oportet fieri, inclinat eorum corda ut hoc velint. Eo ſcil. inclinante qui in nobis mirabili & in effabili modo operatur & velle.

vult

vult id fieri &c. When God will have that to be done, which is not to be done but by men that are willing to doe it, he inclines their hearts that they may be willing, namely, he inclines men, who workes in us after a wonderfull and ineffable manner to will —— And *de bon. perſ. cap.* 13. *nos volumus, ſed Deus in nobis operatur & velle, nos operamur ſed Deus in nobis operatur & operari. We will, but God worketh in us to will; we worke, but its God worketh in us to worke*: It would require a volumne to cite all the paſſages that might be collected out of *Auſtine* to this purpoſe; namely, to ſhew that the grace which he only admits of is efficaciouſly operative, and determining.

Tantum ſpiritu Sancto accenditur voluntas eorum, ut ideo poſſint quia volunt, ideo ſic velint, quia Deus operatur ut velint. *Aug. de Cor. & gr. c.* 12. *Parum eſt permanere in bono ſi velit, niſi etiam efficiatur ut velit.* *Aug de cor. & gr. c.* 11. *Eſt in nobis per hanc dei gratiam, in bono recipiendo & perſeveranter tenendo, non ſolum poſſe quod volumus, verum etiam velle quod poſſumus. Id. Ib.*

3. In this Section as if you had bid farewell to all wholſome reading and to ingenuity, you ſhamefully abuſe the holy man *Auſtin* thus: *If the queſtion* (ſay you) *was, whether God doth not invincibly and indeclinably draw or worke upon the will, then the queſtion could not be between* Auguſtine *and* Pelagius *what kinde of adjutory the will did ſtand in need of, but whether it ſtood in need of an adjutory or a compulſory*; that you may have a pretence for this concluſion, you give your owne *interpretation* of working *invincibly and indeclinably* vpon the will, that is (ſay you) *the will muſt of neceſſity follow the working of God, will it, nill it*, be it never ſo *obſtinate*, or *reſolved* to the contrary; ſo that God ſhould come in with an *unreſiſtible force upon one, and raviſh the will, and force it to conſent contrary to the preſent bent and poſture of it, now this* (ſay you) *is not* adjuvare *to help, but* cogere *to compell. If ſome ſtout Porter ſhould boyſe Mr.* Jenkin *upon his ſhoulder againſt his will, this Porter were not an adjutory.*

Yo. Eld p. 50.

Yo. Eld. p. 51

Anſw. But friend, who ever *thus* interpreted this *invincibly efficacious working* of God upon the will before your Maſters the *Arminians*, and the *Jeſuits* theirs; the *Orthodox* know the *invincibility, certainty*, and *indeclinableneſſe* of the worke of *grace* upon the will no whit promotes your *hereticall inference*, that then *the will* may be *wrought upon whether it will or no*, and ſo compeld; you ſaw in *Buſie Biſhop* the contrary maintained, to which you here anſwer nothing. When God by his *efficacious*

grace

grace works in the will, *to will*, this *efficacious grace*, puts into the will a *non-resistencie*, or taketh away *actuall resistencie*, there being an impossibility that these two should co-exist and meet together in the will, to be wrought upon with efficacious grace, and to resist this being as impossible as for the will in the same moment *to resist* and *not resist*, *to will not to resist and to will to resist*. Hence is that conclusion of *Augustine*; *Humane voluntates non possiunt, &c. Mens wills cannot resist Gods doing what he will, since God deales with the very wills of men as he will, and when he will*; Its a *most odious imputation* cast upon the *grace of* God, that from the *infallibility* of its working upon the will you should conclude a possibility of its *compelling* the will, or *forcing it against its present bent and posture*; will nothing prevaile with you to acquit grace from *compelling the will*, unlesse *putting all the operations of grace that need be put into the ballance, a mans free will must turn the scales, and determine the case whether a man shall be converted or no?* If these be the *institutes* of the *alley*, certainly its as *corrupt* as its *close*, and as narrow in *grace* as *space*. No friend, when you suppose that *efficacious grace* workes upon the will whether it will, or nill, p. 50. you speake contradictions, for that which grace workes is this, *to will*; and *the will is not against the working when under the working of efficacious grace*. Its a happy expression of *Augustines*, *Inspirata gratiæ suavitate, &c. The sweetnesse of grace inspired by the Holy Ghost, makes the soule more to be delighted with what is commanded than with what would hinder it*, & c. 34. Ea quæ pertinent ad justitiam, &c. *Those things that belong to righteousnesse so delight the soule, that griefe doth not so much hinder, as delight prevaileth, & de pec. mer. & rem. l. 2. c. 19.* he calls it (sweetly) Victricem delectationem, *a conquering and victorious delight* that God puts into the soule when he converts it; the will is wrought upon so *sweetly* that it yeelds it selfe to God with the greatest *willingnesse*, and yet so *powerfully*, that it yeelds to him with *unfayling certainty*.

Aug. de Cor. & Gra. cap. 14. Huma & voluntates non possunt resistere quo minus faciat Deus quod vult, quandoquidem etiam de ipsis hominum voluntatibus quod vult, cum vult facit.

Prima gratia data primo Adam est qua fit ut habeat homo justitiam si velit, sed gratia potentior est in secundo Adam qua fit ut velit, tantoque ardore diligat, ut carnis voluntatem contraria concupiscentem voluntate spiritus vincat. Aug. de Cor. & gr. c. 12 Infirmis servavit ut ipso donante in vitiosissime quod bonum est, vellent. Id. ib. Inspirata gratiæ suavitate per spiritum sanctum, faciente plus delectare quod præcipit, quam delectat quod impedit. Id. c. 34. Ea quæ pertinent ad justitiam, fic delectant animum ut quicquid aliud dolor impedit, delectatio superat.

4. Whereas *Austine* said, that there is a two-fold adjutory to

to good, *the one, without which a good worke is not done, the other by and through which a thing is done*; and I having ſaid that the *Pelagians in granting the former never ſatisfied* Auſtine, *denying* (as I feare you doe) *the latter*; hereupon in this *Section* you ſay, that *I am an unhappy man, that neither feares nor faithe but without ground*; you (ſay you) *freely acknowledge ſuch an adjutory of grace, not only without which a good worke is not done, but by which every good work is done.*

A good confeſſion, ſuch an one the *Arminians* make, Decla. Sent. c. 17. ſuch an one *Pelagius*, *Aug. de Gra. Chriſti. c.* 3. ſo that *Auſtine* himſelfe profeſſeth, *Mihi pene perſuaſerat, hanc illam gratiam de quâ quæſtio eſt confiteri*, Ib. c. 37. *Pelagius had almoſt perſwaded me that he granted that grace for which I contended*, but as he ſuffered not *Auſtine*, ſo neither doe you the *Reader* long to retaine any hopes of you, for you inſtantly caſt in your *Coloquintida*, (a *mite* you call it,) which you bequeath to my underſtanding (a bountifull man to give away all you have at once) and it is this; *ſuch an adjutory of grace* (ſay you) *by and through which a thing is done, doth not imply an abſolute neceſſity of effecting that which is effected by it.* *Yo. Eld. p.* 52.

But why doe you involve your ſelfe in darke termes? why make you the ſtreame by your pawing ſo muddy? Come, come; off with your Viſard, ſpeake aloud man, and tell the world; *I ſay with my Maſters, The adjutory of grace doth not infallibly produce that effect which is produced by it; putting all the operations of grace that God uſeth to the working of grace in us, yet converſion is ſo in our power as that we may not be converted; and notwithſtanding all theſe operations, the will may not conſent.* Wherein you fight againſt the Scriptures, which tell us, that *the holy Ghoſt workes in them that beleeve according to his mighty power, and that his power towards beleevers is exceeding great*; and that he workes even this in us *to will*, and Col. Mag. Act. 4. *Quadmodum illius co-operationis illa non eſt irreſiſtibilis. Corvin. Conr. Bogerman, p.* 263. *Poſitis omnibus operationibus quibus ad gratiam in nobis efficiendam Deus utitur, manet tamen ipſa converſio, ita in noſtrâ poteſtate, ut poſſimus non converti. Id. p.* 274. *Iſtis omnibus operationibus non obſtantibus, fieri poſſe ſtatuimus, ut voluntas non conſentiat.*

This your error attributes more to mans will than to God in converſion, man being converted not becauſe God makes

him ſo, but becauſe he will be ſo; God only perſwading, but man of himſelfe conſenting; God only giving a *poſſe velle*, a *poſſe convertì*, a *power* to be converted *if one will*, but man determining himſelfe *to will* or *not to will* as he pleaſeth; by which opinion that which is the greater, and which ſpecifies the event, man performes of himſelfe, to wit, actually to beleeve, convert, and will, and by all the power of Gods grace the will is advanced but to a *middle kinde of ſtate*, *a poſture of indifferency*, or an *indifferent profenſion* to either hand, and God workes only by way of *contingency & ſub hac conditione*, on this condition, that the will by its naturall power will move it ſelfe. Thus *Auguſtine* expreſſeth himſelfe againſt *Pelagius*, *De pec. mer. & rem. l. 2. c. 18. Si nobis libera quædam voluntas ex Deo eſt, &c. If we have a free will from God which yet either can be good or evill, and the good will be of our ſelves, what we have from our ſelves is better than what we have from God, which is moſt abſurd*; ſo that evident it is, that in ſaying you acknowledge with *Auſtine* ſuch an *adjutory of grace by which every good worke is done*, you both delude your ſelfe and your followers; for he by this *adjutory* expreſſeth himſelfe to meane, not ſuch an one by which a man is left to himſelfe, to ſuffer converſion to be wrought or not to be wrought, but ſuch an *adjutory* by which it is *infallibly* wrought Vid. Aug. de cor. & gra. c. 12. *Aliud eſt adjutorium ſine quo aliquid non fit, aliud eſt adjutorium, quo aliquid fit; nam ſine alimentis, &c. There's an adjutory (* ſaith he *) without which a thing is not done, and an adjutory by which a thing is done; we cannot live without food, and yet neither doth he live by food who will dye though he hath it; ſo that food is an adjutory without which we cannot live, not by which it is that we do live; but when bleſſednesſe is beſtowed upon a man, he is forthwith made bleſſed: this is an adjutory not only without which a thing is not done, but by which that is done for which it is given, becauſe if bleſſednesſe be given to a man he forthwith becomes bleſſed; and if it be not given he ſhall never be bleſſed;*

Aug. de pec. mer. & rem. l. 2. c. 18 *Si nobis libera voluntas ex Deo eſt, quæ adhuc poteſt eſſe vel bona, vel mala, bona verò voluntas ex nobis ſit, melius eſt id quod a nobis quàm quod ab illo, quod non niſi abſurdiſſimè dici poſſit.*

Aliud eſt adjutorium ſine quo aliquid non fit, & aliud quo aliquid fit, nam ſine alimentis non poſſumus vivere, nec tamen cum affuerint alimenta, eis fit ut vivat qui mori voluerit, ergo adjutorium alimentorum eſt ſine quo non fit, non quo fit ut vivamus, ut vero beatitudo quam non habet homo, cum data fuerit, continuò fit beatus, hoc adjutorium eſt non ſolum ſine quo non fit, verum etiam quo fit propter quod datur quia & ſi data fuerit homini beatitudo, continuo fit beatus, & ſi data non fuerit, nunquam erit; alimenta verò non conſequenter faciunt ut homo vivat.

bu

but it followes not that a man ſhall live by having food, onely without food he cannot live. If your adjutory be the ſame with *Auſtines* tell me; I charged you from your accuſing of the Miniſters with *Manicheiſm* that you underſtood not what it was.

1. In the next Section you give me an account therefore of your profound knowledge what *Manicheiſm* is, and having cited a ſentence out of *Auguſtine*, *Serm. de temp.* 191. *They erre who with Manicheus affirme that a man cannot avoyd ſinne, &c. ---from this paſſage you ſay it clearly appeares, that one notorious ſtraine of the Manichean errour was this; that men by the eternall, unchangeable, irreſiſtible decree of God, are put into, or left in ſuch a condition, wherein it is impoſſible but that they ſhould ſinne.* To. Eld. p. 53.

Anſw. Who is the *illiterate ſoule now?* had you required from me an account of *Manicheiſm* out of the *Fathers*, and had I given you ſuch an ignorant anſwer as this, I had deſerved to have changed my *Seraglio* for the *Ware-houſe?* From whom have it you, that the *Manichees* held that man was put into, or left in ſuch a condition of ſin by any *decree of God?* Is this your knowledge of *Manicheiſm?* had you held your peace haply you would have been accounted wiſe in this point; but now Scholars are aſhamed of you. Did the *Manichees* hold that a man could not avoyd ſinne, from the *unchangeableneſſe* of Gods *decree? Jerom* would have inform'd you better; *Manicheorum eſt hominum damnare naturam, & liberum auferre arbitrium. It is Manicheiſm to condemne the* nature *of man, and to diſpoile it of free will*; and *Auguſtine hær.* 46 *Peccatorum Originem non libero arbitrio voluntatis, ſed ſubſtantiæ tribuunt gentis adverſæ. The Manichees* aſſerted *impoſſibility to avoyd ſinfrom the very* being of nature *in it ſelfe, which* could not *but be bad*; and their Principles were: 1. *Peccatum eſſe ſubſtantiam, & οὐσίαν per ſe viventem & ſubſiſtentem, non autem tantum, qualitatem quandam, affectionemque vel mali & mentis a ratione averſæ, quæ ſubſtantiæ ſupervenerit*; *that ſinne was a ſubſtance, living, and ſubſiſting of it ſelfe, and not onely a quality, or an affection of the minde averſe from reaſon, which did ſupervene.* Hier. ad Ctes. Dan. de hær. c. 46.

2. They held *voluntatem malè agendi nobis à naturâ ipsâ inſitam eſſe, non ex rebellione noſtrâ accerſitam, vel inobedientia natam*, That *the will of doing evill was from the* very nature, *not fetcht from rebel-*

him and disobedience; for Austin chargeth them to hold, that Malum wasex natura nescio quâ semper malâ, that sin was from a kinde of nature alwaies evill; And Jerome saith they held, That nature it self was evill, and could by no meanes be changed; he saying in that place, That no man ever heard him say so. Evident it is that the Manichees asserted such a necessity of sin, as that it was repugnant to the very being of nature not to sin; and blush you not to cast such a senceleſſe imputation upon the Miniſters of Christ? Did they whom you accuſe of Manicheiſm ever ſay or thinke that ſin was from any nature unchangeably evill? or that we ſin by a neceſſity of nature? or in regard of the unchangeable decree of God, that nothing can come to paſſe contingently, ſo as that it would have been againſt the nature of the creature to have acted otherwiſe? bringeth not learned* Piſcator the inſtance of breaking the legs of Christ? ſaith he not that though it were determined by the decree of God, that his legs ſhould not be broken, yet by the nature and will of the Souldiers ſuch a thing might have been? And the laſt mentioned Father thus meets with your argument from the unchangeableneſſe of Gods Decrees. Aske the Apoſtle (ſaith he) quæ neceſſitas, &c. what neceſſity binders the will? what force commands it to do things worthy of hatred, that it ſhould be compelled to do not what it would, but what it would not and hates to do? Will not (ſaith Jerome) the Apoſtle anſwer, O man who art thou that diſputeſt againſt God? ſhall the thing formed ſay to him that formed it, Why haſt thou made me thus? Object to God a ſtronger calumny, for 'tis ſaid, Eſau and Jacob being yet in the wombe, he hated the one and loved the other; and Auſtine, to whom the Pelagians objected that he brought in Manicheiſm by the Doctrine of the neceſſity of the ſpirit (the making of which objection is pure Goodwiniſm) in ſeverall places ſaith, that the Catholici go in a middle way betweene Manicheiſm and Pelagianiſm. Contr. du. ep. Pel. l. 4. c. 3. A Catholike ſo aſſerts free will, that he ſaith the ſin of Angels and men came not from I cannot tell what nature alwaies evill, which is none, but from the will it ſelf, and this overthrowes the hereſie of the Manichees, nor therefore that the captive will can attaine to a ſaving liberty but by the grace of God, and this overthrowes the hereſie of the Pelagians. And Contr. du.

Aug. l. 4 c. 3. Contra duas ep. Pel. Aſſerunt malam eſſe naturam, quæ immutari nullo modo poteſt. A me nunquam audies malam eſſe naturam.

Reſp. Apol, p. 23.

Quæ neceſſitas illius impediat voluntatem, quæ tanta vis odio digna imperet facere, ut non quod vult ſed quod non vult, & odit, facere compellatur? Reſpondebit tu quis es? &c. Vid. voſ. hiſt. Pel. l. 3. p. 2.

du. ep. Pel. l. 2. c. 5. *Peccato Adæ, &c. We say not* (saith he) *that by the sin of Adam free will is perisht, but that in men that are slaues to Satan it hath no strength to holy liuing, vnlesse the will of men be deliuered.* To conclude, The *Manichees* tooke away the *very nature of man* i.e. *the liberty of nature, we deny to a man not regenerate only liberty in respect of grace.* In your former pamphlet you said that you were about to preach against *Manicheisme*; I suppose that the *treasury* of your understanding is not so full as yet, but that it will hold one *mite* more, take this therefore; but if you consult with *Aug. de ciu. d. l.* 5. *c.* 10, 11. and *Zanc. de oper. dei l.* 4. *c.* 4. *q.*4. you may receive of their bounty, if at least they give you not more than your treasury can hold.

Sic asserit Catholicus liberum arbitrium, ut non ex natura nescio quâ quæ nulla est sed ex ipso arbitrio Cæpisse dicat & angeli & hominis malum, quod euertit hæresin manichæam nec ideo posse captiuam voluntatem, nisi Adæ arbitrium liberum de hominum natura periisse non dicimus, sed in hominibus subditis diabolo. ad bene, pieq; viuendum non valere, nisi, ipsa voluntas hominis fuerit liberata. Morton Apol. p. 1. c. 30. Alsted. Suppl. de Not. Ecc. *Manichæi naturam hominis tollebant, i.e. libertatem naturæ, nos homini nondum regenito derogamus libertatem gratiæ.*

dei gratia, respirare in salubrem libertatem quod euertit hæresin Pelagianam. Peccato

2. In this your section you liberally charge * *two famous Diuines* of the *reformed Churches* with *Manicheisme*, but childishly prove no more the charge against them, than you proued out of your Grammar rules, by which you answered Master *Edwards* his *Antapologia*, that there was no *kisse of loue* or *anointing with oyl* you know where---Your onely argument whereby you endeavour to prove their opinions guilty of that imputation, being this: *If such tenets as these be not pure Manicheisme, I know not what Manicheisme is.* (Who ever said that you did know?) This is somewhat like your *learned confutation* of the *disputation* at *Christ-Church* concerning *tithes*, where you having weakly and pittifully *yeelded* the *question*, you vindicated your self shortly after, in your preface to your *Hag.* with this *burly* but *haggarly* dictate, *I (infallible John) profes vnfeignedly, the two arguments brought for the payment of tithes were no more able to carry the cause, than two lambs to draw a waggon*; such stout confutations as these are current coyn no where but in the *Alley*.

Yo. Eid. p. 54. * *Triglandius* and *Piscator.*

You tell the Reader that some passages in these two *learned men* (whose *umbra meridiana* you (as yet) are not in understanding of *Polemicall Diuinity*) sauour of *Manicheisme*; but you prove it

not, nay you doe not ſo much as pretend to goe about to prove it; I deny it with the ſame facility that you aſſerted it. *Aſſerenti incumbit probatio*; only I deſire the Reader to take notice, that *Manicheiſm* cannot be imputed to the former, to *Triglandius*, for what he here ſaith, but it muſt be charged upon the *Apoſtles*, *Act.* 4. 28. and for *Piſcator*, he is cleared by the acknowledgement of *Vorſtius* himſelfe, *John Goodwins* friend and *Piſcators* erroneous though farre more learned adverſary.

Sect. 65. *Yo. Eld. p.* 54. You goe on; you ſay that I underſtand not the will of God in the Scriptures, &c. becauſe from Act. 26. 18. where *Paul* ſaith, that *he was ſent to the Gentiles to open their eyes, &c.* I proved that *Converſion is the reſtoring of ſight, not of light only; the opening of the eyes, not the bringing of light to them who have eyes already*; upon which paſſage of mine you comment thus:

1 You ſay, *I am ridiculous in making an oppoſition betweene opening of mens eyes, and bringing light to them who have eyes already, as if men who had eyes to be opened had not (yet) eyes already.*

Anſw. Moſt fulſome! In Scripture Phraſe *to open the eyes* is to give *ſight*, and not *light only*. In *Joh.* 9. 10. 11. 21. 26. 30. the blinde man is ſaid to have had his *eyes opened*, what's that if not that he had *ſight* beſtowed upon him? not (according to Mr. *Goodwin*) that he had light only brought to him *having good eyes already*. His eyes are ſaid to be opened, though he were borne blinde.

2 Thus you proceed; *The Scripture by the opening of the eyes of men in converſion, meane only ſuch an opening as is proper for the light to effect, for as darknes ſhuts mens eyes, and the light of the morning opens mens eyes.* So here,

Anſw. If this be ſo, what is the worke of grace upon *the underſtanding?* The light irradiats or cleares the *medium*, but gives no *ſtrength* to the *organ*; ſo (ſay you) 'tis in *converſion*, a *naturall man* hath *good eyes* already, let the *object* be but clearly propoſed, and he can ſee it; is not this *pure Pelagianiſm*, to place grace in the *giving of the Word?* But know according to Scripture, a naturall man wants *ſight* as well as *light*, Deut. 29. 4 *the Lord hath not given you a heart to perceive, nor eyes to ſee; open mine eyes* (ſaith *David*) *Pſ.* 119. and *Eſ.* 42. 7. Chriſt is ſaid to *open the blinde eyes*, Pro. 20. 12. *The hearing eare, and ſeeing eye are made*

by

by God. And 1 *Jo.* 5. 20. *He hath given us an understanding to know him.* And the *Apostle* tells us, not that *we were in* the *darke*, but that *we were darknesse*, Eph. 5. 8. you told us, Sion Col. visit, p. *that you have alwaies asserted the necessity of grace by way of adjutory*; now I understand what grace you meane, none that conferres any power upon the faculty by which it is inabled to act, but only restores it to a capacity of present acting. But you desire to prove your error; 1. by Scripture, *Matth.* 4. 16. 2 *Cor.* 4. 4, &c.

But why ground you not an argument from any or all of these Scriptures, that by giving of *spiritual sight* is only meant the giving of *light*, as the Sun or the Morning may be said to *open* mens *eyes?* Nay, why doe you not so much as recite the words of the text, but only set downe the *figures* of Chapters and Verses. There's not one of them that make for your purpose, and some that make directly against you, Mat. 4. 16. *The people that sat in darknesse saw great light*; *Ergo quid?* therefore in conversion, because God gives the *light by which* he doth not also give the *sight with which* we spiritually see. Doth his giving the one to this people prove that he did not also give the other to those among them, that were savingly *inlightned*; blinde *Bartimeus* sees *the light* when *Christ* recovers him from his *blindnesse*, therefore his recovery was only effected by the comming of the *light*, and not by the worke of *Christ* in bestowing *a power of seeing* upon his *eyes*; so here the people *saw great light*, that is (according to *G.* the glosmaker) they saw only by having the *light* of *the Gospell*; for that place out of the 2 Cor. 4. 4 *The god of this world hath blinded the mindes of them that beleeve not, lest the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ should shine unto them*; it makes directly against him: 1. The *naturall man* of whom the *Apostle* speakes is here said to be *blinded*, which Mr. *Goodwin* denies; for he only grants that a naturall man is as a man in the *darknesse of the night*, not *blinde*, but *his eyes are good.* 2. Its said, *lest the light of the Gospel should shine unto them*; evidently importing that their blindnes hindred the light from shining unto them, & that though these *naturall men* had *the light of* the Gospel shining among them, yet they were blinde for all that, when as Mr. *G.* tells us, *its proper for the light to effect the opening of the eyes of men in conversion*; but here was *light* without *sight*: This quotation

Yo. Eld. p. 54.

Id. Ib.

on feare (if it be not falſe printed) he laid before him, not to confirme, but to confute his errour.

To. Eld. p. 55. But you labour by argument to maintaine your errour thus; *If men ſhould have the eyes of their minder opened in any other ſence, then that wherein the light may be ſaid to open them, God muſt be ſaid to worke as many miracles as converſions; and how then can that great Pillar of Presbitery, that Miracles are ceaſed, ſtand.*

Anſw. I deſire to know why you call the *ceſſation of Miracles a pillar of Plesbitery*; 1. If ceſſation of Miracles be a pillar of Presbitery, I pray take heed leſt in oppoſition to *a Pillar of Presbitery*, you cry *up Miracles* as you cry downe the Word; ſome of you (I heare) begin. Your engagement againſt *queriſme* or *ſeeking*, mentioned in *Sion Colledge viſited*, I plainly ſee will come to nothing. Rather than *Presbitery* ſhall not *ſinke*, you will *ſeek*. 2. What doe *Presbiterians* as *ſuch*, build upon the *ceſſation of Miracles*. 3. It ſeemes by your arguing, that you know not what a *Miracle* is; *Polanus* (I remember) *Lib.* 6. *c.* 58 makes this the firſt condition of a Miracle, that it be *viſible and externall*, and he proves it by many Scriptures: *Miracula neceſſe eſt ſenſui expoſita eſſe, quia debent convincere infideles, &c. Miracles ought to be externall for conviction of unbeleevers, or confirmation of beleevers.* You cannot ſay this of the opening of the *eyes of mens mindes in converſion*, taken either in *your* ſence or *mine*, *vid. Greg. valen. To.* 1. *Diſp.* 8. *c.* 3. *p.* 2. It's in courteſie that I returne not upon you thoſe undervalewing expreſſions *of illiterate ſilly-braine, &c.* I can eaſily grant the worke you ſpeake of, to be a *greater* and more admirable work than many *Miracles*, and yet not a *Miracle* properly ſo called.

Nos non aſſerimus Dei brachium ſic hodie eſſe abbreviatum, ut miracula nulla concedat, præſertim iis qui Evangelium ſincerè conantur inter Ethnicos prædicare, ſed negamus iſta inter Chriſtianos, de articulis nonnullis diſſentientes, ad mittenda eſſe ut veritatis gnoriſmata, aut criteria, Prid. orat. 10. *pag.* 99. *quæ inviſibilia & occulta ſunt, miracula non ſunt. Pol. ſynt. Lib.* 6. *Cap.* 58.

3. In this Section you weakly cavill againſt my quotation, *Eph.* 2. *Dead in treſpaſſes and ſins*; you ſay the Apoſtle *only* meaneth that they were *guilty of death, and liable to condemnation.*

1 Before you had ſo peremptorily pronounced your *gloſs* upon this place (which if you know any thing you know is cited by all writers of Controverſies againſt *Papiſts* and *Arminians*, as by me) you ſhould have furniſhed your ſelfe with *ſtronger arguments.* 1 You

1 You ſay this their *death in ſins and treſpaſſes* is explained by their being *children of wrath, ver.* 3. —— but is this to underſtand the Scripture? had it bin as eaſie for you to have *proved* as to have ſaid it, we ſhould have had an *argument* inſtead of *a dictate*, but you only give the latter, &c. The ſcope of the *Apoſtle* is to illuſtrate the benefits we receive by *Chriſt*, this he doth by the calling to minde our former miſery out of *Chriſt*, this miſery was 1. our *ſpirituall bondage* to *ſinne*, and 2. for *ſinne* to *wrath*. The former contained in the 1. verſ. *Dead in treſpaſſes and ſinnes*, every naturall man being totally void of *ſpirituall life*, and ſo under the power of ſinne that he can do nothing holily. The latter contained in the 3. verſ. *children of wrath*; in which 3. verſ. the *Apoſtle* expreſſeth that practicall unholineſſe (held forth in the 2. verſ. as the fruit of their *death in ſins*) by ſhewing 1. who they were that had lived in it, *Jewes* as well as *Gentiles*, *alſo we all*, &c. 2. By ſhewing wherein it conſiſted, they had *converſations in luſts of the fleſh, fulfilling*, &c. 3. by ſhewing what they deſerved, or the puniſhment to which they were liable when they lived ſo, *they were children of wrath.*

Thus the moſt learned *Calvin* upon this place, interprets this of the Apoſtle *dead in ſins. Non intellegit ſolum fuiſſe*, &c. *The Apoſtle underſtands not only* (ſaith *Calvin*) *that they were in danger of death* (Mr. *Goodwin* ſaith, *liable to death*) but he *ſignifies a reall and a preſent death*; *all are borne dead, and live dead till they are made partakers of the life of Chriſt*; *whence is that of* John, *The dead ſhall heare the voyce of the Sonne of God, and they who heare ſhall live.* So *Piſcator* alſo upon the place; *Homo naturâ mancipium*, &c. *Man by nature is a ſlave to Satan, whom he ſerves in committing ſin, and therefore is a childe of wrath and guilty of damnation.* So *Davenant*; *anima moritur*, &c. *the ſoule dieth, in as much as ſinne by its impurity diſſolves that union of the ſoule to God, wherein ſtands ſpirituall life.* You ſee that Expoſitors underſtand by this *death in*

Calvin in Lo. *Non intelligit ſolum fuiſſe in mortis periculo, ſed realem mortem ſignificat, ac præſentem quâ jam erant oppreſſi; omnes mortui naſcimur, donec efficiamur vitæ Chriſti participes, unde illud Johannis. Omnis homo naturaliter mortuus eſt in hac nativa ſua corruptione, quia nulla pars animæ poteſt in ſpiritualibus vitalem actum exercere.* Dav. in 2 Col 13. *Anima moritur morte gratiæ quatenus peccatum ſua impuritate diſſolvit gratuitam animæ unionem ad Deum, in qua ſita eſt vita ſpiritualis.* Id. ib. Piſc. *In loc. homo natura mancipium eſt diaboli, cui ſervit perpetrando peccata, ac proinde eſt filius iræ, h. e. reus damnationis.* Piſc. in loc. *Quum dicit quos ſignificat ſe conceptos & natos eſſe in peccato, ac proinde reos mortis, nam ſingulis naturaliter naſcentibus imputatur Adæ lapſus, & in ſingulos naſcendo propagatur naturæ corruptio ſeu pravitas.*

ſinne,&c. that our *native corruptedneſſe* whereby we become *guilty*, and *we are made liable to wrath*, not the *guilt*, and *liableneſſe it ſelf*.

2 You ſay, that *quickning together with Chriſt oppoſed to this death is interpreted, Col.* 2. 13. *to be the forgiveneſſe of ſinnes.* You that deny the *Scripture*, feare not to pervert it; the Apoſtle makes not *forgiveneſſe of ſinne* the *formalis ratio* of *vivification*; *by quickning together with Chriſt*, he underſtands a *ſpirituall reparation, and forming of the Divine Image in us, by which the filth and pollution of ſinne is wip'd away, and we are made his Workmanſhip, created in Chriſt Jeſus to good workes.* So *Davenant*; *wherever ſin is remitted, and its guilt taken away, there is this vivification* by grace. *Piſcator* ſaith expreſly upon the place, *that by vivification the Apoſtle intends the renovation of nature.*

Davenant, *in* 2 Col. 13.

Deus animam vivificat illum reparando, & ſordes peccati detergendo, ipſius enim factura ſumus, creati in Chriſto Jeſu in operibus bonis.——Per vivificationem intelligit novæ renovationem; quod ipſum, Rom 6. 11. *Vocat vivere Deo ambulare in novitate vitæ.* Ro. 6. 4. Piſc in loc.

3 *You ſay the Scripture expreſſeth the condition of guilt by the terme of death, therefore by dead in treſpaſſes we muſt underſtand guilty of death, &c.* 2 *Sam.* 9. 8 -- 16. 9 -- 19. 28 *Rom.* 8. 10. 2 *Cor.* 5. 14. 1 *Tim.* 5. 6.

That the Scripture doth often expreſſe the *condition of guilt* by the terme of *death* though I deny not, yet the Scriptures which you *cite*, prove nothing leſſe; thoſe places, 2 *Sam.* 9. 8. where *Mephib.* ſaith to *David*, *What is thy ſervant that thou ſhouldeſt looke upon ſuch a dead Dog*, 2 Sam. 16. 9. and *Abiſhai* cals *Shimei a dead Dog, &c.* have no other ſence than 1 *Sam.* 24. 14. where *David* expoſtulating with *Saul*, asketh him, *after whom is the King of Iſrael come out, after whom doſt thou purſue, after a dead Dog, after a flea?* in which words the word *dead* notes not *guilty* as you moſt *ignorantly* ſuppoſe, but *vile, contemptible, baſe*; that of 1 *Tim.* 5. 6. where the *widow* is ſaid to be *dead while ſhe liveth*, is by moſt underſtood to be meant of *ſpirituall death*, and by the happy interpreter of Scripture, learned *Calvin*, its underſtood of her *unprofitableneſſe*, and her being *nothing worth*, q. d. *thoſe widowes who love to live without all care, and paſſe their times idely and in pleaſure are no more uſefull, profitable in their places then if they were dead*; Mortuas vocat quæ nulli ſunt uſui, *he*

Vivens vita naturali mortua morte ſpirituali, Piſ. in Loc.

cals

cals thoſe dead which ſerve for no uſe; now your interpetation is, *the widow that lives in pleaſures is guilty of death, if I may have* John Calvin, *let who will have* John Goodwin *for their Expoſitor*. That of 2 *Cor.* 5. 14. comprehends both *liableneſſe to eternall death*, and *ſpirituall death alſo*, as all interpreters agree.

4 Laſtly, whereas you moſt unworthily and wretchedly aſſert, that *dead in ſins is not repreſented by the Apoſtle as the condition of men conſidered as naturall, but of men who have a long time continued in ſinne*, the context witneſſeth againſt you; for 1. Firſt the *Apoſtle* tels them what they were *by nature*, ϕυσει verſe 3. not only by *practice*; 2. He makes their *walking in ſinne a fruit* of their *death in it*, ver. 2. *dead in ſinnes wherein ye walked*; 3. this *death in ſinne is* repreſented by the *Apoſtle* as common to all, *Jewes and Gentiles*; and the *Apoſtle* certainly intends that the *death* is as *extenſive* as the *quickning*, which latter Mr. *Goodwin* will not limit unto thoſe that have a long time continued in ſins, he intends that all were *dead* that ever were quickned, old and young. Your Expoſitions are huskes, food fitter for ſwine than ſoules; the Lord grant that your poore miſled followers may no longer lay out their money for that which is not bread.

Upon your ſaying, that *by the improvement of nature a man may attaine to ſuch a conviction, as upon which ſaving converſion alwaies followes*; I demanded *what place is here left for grace?* you reply in this Section: *Sect.* 66. *Yo. Eli p.* 56 *Bu. Buſh. p.* 29.

1 By asking me, *If a man who is able, through lazineſſe were unwilling to goe an hundred miles in foure dayes for the ſaving of his life, is there not place left for the kindneſſe of his friends to accommodate him with an horſe?*

Anſw. There's *no place* according to this ſuppoſition left for *grace*, by way of *abſolute neceſſity*, but only by way of *accommodation, and facilitation of the worke*, he ſtands in no *abſolute neceſſity* of an horſe to carry him, that is able to goe his journey on his ten toes, you now loudly ſpeake your ſelfe a *Pelagian*: you told me before that the *naturall man* needed *not eye-ſight but light only*, and now you ſay he needs not the *help of God* ſave by way of *accomodation*, he can of himſelfe *will*, or make *himſelfe willing* to beleeve, only not *ſo eaſily*; *deteſtable doctrine!* and yet,

Yo. Eld. p. 56. 2 In this Section you tell me, *there is place enough for all the grace of God which the Apostle attributes unto him*, Phil. 2. 13. *in working both to will and to doe in men of his good pleasure.*

Answ. I flatly deny it; the Apostle in that place ascribes the work of faith to God *wholly and necessarily*; you ascribe it to him but by way of *partiality* and *conveniency*. According to your late *resemblance* God comes in, in a *super-added* way, and makes us to *beleeve* who yet are *able* to make our selves do so. The *Apostle* saith, *God workes according to his owne good pleasure*, but you, That *God workes according to mans good pleasure*, otherwise you suppose, That *God should worke in man whether he would or no*, and that *grace* would be a *compulsorium*, not an *adjutorium*.

Yo Eld. p. 56. 3. You say, That *there is far larger place left for grace by your opinion than by mine.* If you can evince this, *Eris mihi magnus Apollo*, my opinion saith *with the Apostle, God hath quickned us being dead in trespasses and sins*, till which quickning (the fruit of his rich love) we lye under a *present, reall, spirituall death*, and can do no act of spirituall life as to beleeve, &c. You say, *That this death implyes no impotency to believe, but onely consisteth in guilt, so that as to the being able to beleeve all naturall men are alive.* My opinion saith, This grace of God is *infallibly effectuall*; yours, That it may be *rejected*, and that there's no infallibility in its *effecting* any thing. You say, That God *onely gives light*; I, that God gives light and *eyes* to behold it. In a Word, You hold that God gives *food*; I, That he gives life, which is more than meat. And now leaves your opinion a larger place for grace than mine?

Yo. Eld. p. 55.

Yo. Eld. p. 52.

4. You endeavour to prove, That your opinion leaves a *larger place* than mine for that grace which the *Apostle* attributes to God, Phil. 2. 13. You say, *'tis a greater act of grace to forgive the sins of one who knowes how to do well and yet doth evill, than to forgive the sins of him that hath no power to do well*; the latter is Mr. *Jenkin* his sinner, the former mine.

Yo. Eld. p. 56.

Ergo quid? therefore your opinion leaves a larger place for that *grace* which the Apostle attributes to God, in *working* to *will and to do*, Phil. 2. 13.

1. Whether now Sir? have we a wandring *Jew*, or a wandring *John*, you are quite gone from the question; we were disputing

puting about the *grace* of *converſion*, and the Apoſtle was aſſerting this, and now you flye to the grace of *remiſſion*. Its not this latter that the Apoſtle in *this place Phil.*2.13. attributes to God; he ſpeaks not of God pardoning the *evill* which we have done but of giving the will to do that good which of our ſelves we cannot do. And by the way, I cannot but obſerve your perfect conformity with *Pelagius*, one ſpirit acts you both.

Sic Oculos, ſic ille manus, ſic ora ferebat, juſt ſo and ſo, with eyes, hands, face, he acted. *Pelagius* ſaid, that the *grace of God*, *which was neither Law nor nature, onely did ſerve for the remiſſion of former ſins, not for the avoyding of future ſins, &c.* So *Julian* the Pelagian expounds that place, *who ſhall deliver me from this body of death?* i. e. *Who* (ſaith he) *ſhall deliver me from the guilt of my ſins, which I have committed when as I could have avoyded them?*

Gratiam Dei, quæ neq; lex eſt, neq; natura, in hoc tantum valere, ut peccata præterita dimittantur, non ut futura vitentur, &c.

2. In propoſing the object of this *grace* (*a ſinner*) you deale unworthily, in concealing both what *your ſelf* hold, and what I hold; for *your ſinner* is one that wants no ability, either in *his underſtanding* to *know* the things of God, or in his *will* to *embrace* them; the *grace* he wants is onely *outward light* for the *underſtanding*, and *morall perſwaſion* for the *will*, which is left to its *owne choice*, whether it will *embrace* what is offered it or no, and when it hath *received* all from God, there's a poſſibility of *non-converſion*; whereas my ſinner is one that is in *ſpirituall things ſtarke blinde*, that neither *knowes* nor is able to *receive* the things of God, that in his *will* is wholly unable to *embrace* them; this inability ariſing from his *pravity* and *luſts*, which have put out *his eyes*, and made him an *Enemy* to God, ſo that he *hates light* and *reformation*, and the *grace* that I ſtand for, is ſuch as *renewes* the *underſtanding*, and *changes* the *will* not onely by affording *light* and *perſwaſion*, but by *an infallibly effectuall power*. And now let any judge whether of theſe is the more *miſerable ſinner?* whether of theſe the more *glorious worke of grace?* you will have *grace* for the *accommodation and facilitation of* the work; I maintaine it to be *ſimply neceſſary*. *Your ſinner is but in a ſleep, and may poſſibly awake of himſelf, mine is dead, and cannot live but by the power of grace.*

Quis me liberabit à reatu peccatorum meorum quæ commiſi cum vitare potuiſſem. Conter. Jul. l. 1. f. 85.

Yo. Eld p.65.

2. You ſay, *For God to give a man ſtrength and power to believe twice over, or after a forfeiture made by ſin, of the firſt donation,*

Yo. Eld. p. 57.

is an act of more grace than to confer them onely once, and that without any such provocation. Master *Jenkins* opinion leaves place only for the latter act of *grace*, whereas my opinion makes rome for the former.

Answ. To say nothing of your *non-sence* in this passage, here is *abominable falshood.*

Do I deny that God gives a man *strength* to beleeve *twice over?* I have ever taught that God *created* man in his *owne image*, in all the *faculties of his soule*, which when man had *defaced and lost*, and thereby infinitely provoked God, that God of his infinite goodnesse by the power of his *Word and spirit* of grace, doth *renew* in man that *image*, giving him not onely *ability* to repent and beleeve if he will, but working in him *to will* and *to do* according to his *good pleasure, giving repentance*, and being *the author and finisher of our faith.*

5. I having demanded of you how this your position, *upon the improvement of nature, a man may attaine to such a conviction, upon which saving conversion alwayes followes*, agrees with that of the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 4. 7. *Who maketh thee to differ from another?* And I having said that Master *Goodwins* answer to this question of the Apostle, is *my self by my improvement of nature*,

1. You say, That these words, *from another*, are not in the *Originall.* There its onely found thus, τίς σε διακρίνει; Who makes thee differ, subtill Sir? can there be any difference if there be none to differ from?

2. You demand *how your opinion leads you to make such an answer as I put into your mouth?* Relate your opinion and you shall finde the answer at hand, You who say, That *conversion* alwayes *followes a conviction obtained by the improvement of nature*, *D.a.p.* 200. You who say, *A naturall man may do such things, as whereunto God hath by way of promise annexed grace and acceptation*, pag. 26. And hold, That *after every worke of grace, the will remaines in æquilibrio, and may convert or refuse to be converted*, pag. 52. 65. resolving *actuall conversion* not into *the efficacy of the grace of God*, pag. 52. but into *the compliance of mans will.* And yet will not say with your friend *Episcopius*, *Ego meipsum discrevi, I have made my self to differ*, upon this your forbearance you may be lookt upon as *more courteous*, but by no wise man as *lesse heretically* than

Episcopius

Epiſcopias; if in your next you will determine this queſtion, whether the *ſame grace being afforded to two ſinners of the ſame degree, one may be* converted, and *not the other*, you will haply be better knowne to your ſelfe in this point.

Your ſixty ſeventh, and ſixty eighth Section followes, where- *Yo. Eld. p. 58. Sect. 67.*
in you *proclaime your ſinne*; in the former you ſay, that theſe words, (*who made thee to differ*) *exclude not the creature from being the cauſe of its differing in a way of inferiour* efficiency, and *cauſalty*, for if it be (ſay you) the *creature it ſelfe, and not God who beleeveth, then is it the creature it ſelfe and not God which maketh it ſelfe to differ.*

Anſw. The Apoſtle removes all cauſe of *glorying* from man, and therefore leaves no ſhare in the *efficiency* of this worke to man. 2. The *Apoſtle* denyes moſt *vehemently, that man hath any thing which he hath not received*; therefore a man hath not this *concurrence* of his will with the grace of God. It is very true that a man *beleeves* when he *beleeves*, and it is *man*, and *not God* who *beleeveth*; but the queſtion is, who maketh him to *beleeve?* certainly that is not of *himſelfe, it is the gift of God.*

In the next Section you ſay, *Evident it is that* the Apoſtle *Yo. Eld. p. 59. Sect. 68.*
ſpeakes not of any *difference between man and man, which is made by faith, or by any ſaving worke in either, but of ſuch a difference which ſtands in more or fewer, in greater or leſſer gifts. A difference frequent in the primitive times, and God was indeed the ſole cauſe of ſuch differings.*

Anſw. Profound! 1. God was the ſole cauſe (you ſay) of *ſpirituall gifts, ſpeaking with tongues, &c.* but not of *beleeving*, for *here* you ſay, that *man himſelfe* is a ſubordinate cauſe, *its man that beleeves when he beleeves, and not God*; but how prove you that God is rather the ſole Author of *ſpirituall gifts*, than of *ſaving graces*; I thought that the former, *gifts*, had not been (as *grace*) *above nature*, but had been *attaineable by ſtudy and induſtry*; you ſay that its man that *beleeves*, when he *beleeves*; and is't not man that *ſpeakes with tongues*, when he *ſpeakes*; you ſay, that *man beleeves and not God*, and is't not *man that ſpeakes with tongues and not God*; take him, not *Bedlam*, but *Beth-lehem.*

2 Doth not the *Apoſtle* make uſe of *generall maximes, as that none but God makes to differ, and that there's nothing that a man hath*

hath but he received it, according to that of the third of *John*, *A man can receive nothing unleſſe it be given him from heaven*; and drawes not the *Apoſtle* theſe *generall maximes* downe to this *particular caſe*, of which he is ſpeaking.

3 Cannot a man make himſelfe *to differ* from another in the *leaſt things*, *as more or fewer gifts*, and can a man *make himſelfe to differ* in the *greater*.

You conclude this Section with ſinging your *Io Paan*; thus you chante to the Reader, *you have ſeene the young mans nakednesſe in point of arguing*; *he neither leavies reaſons nor Scriptures with any pertinency. There's not the leaſt haire of the head of my opinion concerning the naturall mans power to good ſupernaturall falne to the ground*; which paſſage I am confident every pious and prudent Reader will interpret thus: *You have ſeene the old mans nakednesſe in point of anſwering, he neither anſwers Scriptures nor reaſons, with either piety or pertinency, and there's not only the haire of the head of his opinion concerning the naturall mans power, &c. but even that very head it ſelfe falne to the ground, being ſtruck off by the ſword of the Spirit, the Word of God*, who I deſire may have the only glory of it.

Yo. Eld. p. 60.

Yo. Eld. p. 60. Sect. 69. I propounded, *Buſie Biſh. p.* 54. foure quæries to you, to know what kinde of *adjutory* it was which you acknowledg'd *grace* to be, that you might not under the pretended name of *grace* obtrude nature, as the *Pelagians* of old, and *Jeſuits* and *Arminians* of late have done, and now you come to taſte my *genius* and *ſtrength* (you ſay) in *quæreing*. You begin with a *ſcoffe*; you ſay *Ariſtotle cannot anſwer ſo much as an aſſe can aske*; you have prefac'd a good apology for the weaknes of your following anſwers for how then, ſay I, ſhould *an aſſe anſwer more then ever Ariſtotle could aske?* you are ſuch a friend to *independency*, that your firſt quarrell againſt my *quæres* is, that they have a *dependance* the three laſt upon the firſt.

Yo. Eld. Sect. 69.

My firſt quæree, is whether grace be an *adjutory by way of influence into the will, or by way of concourſe unto the work only*.

Your anſwer is, you underſtand it not; *he hath oppoſed me with his firſt queſtion.*

I ſee my miſhap to aske a *tallent* of him that is not worth a *mite*, and your audaciouſneſſe to undertake to be a *Rabbi*, and

to

to pretend to a tractate of the power of *naturall mans will to good supernaturall*, like those Νομισμάταλοι that did not *know what they said, or whereof they did affirme.*

This queſtion is of great weight, famous in the Schooles, and the firſt uſually handled in this controverſie, but I perceive that *Jeſuits* and *remonſtrants are halfe as bad to you as modall Propoſitions in Logick, De quibus non guſtabit Aſinus*; what? *J. Goodwin* appoſed? he? even he, not underſtand a queſtion ſo *frequently agitated? Penottus* in his *Propugna. hum. lib. L. 8. C. 15.* propounds it thus: *An concurſus Divinus ſit influxus in ſecundas cauſas, & in illarum effectus, an ſolus ſit influxus cum cauſis ſecundis in effectus, non autem in ipſas ſecundas cauſas? eſſe vero hanc controverſiam graviſſimam, &c. Whether the divine concourſe be an influx into the ſecond cauſes, and into their effects, or only with the ſecond cauſes into the effects, and not into the cauſes themſelves?* So *Alvar. de auxil. lib. 3. diſp. 18. &c.* and this queſtion was determined in the *affirmative* by *Auguſtine de grâ Chri. c. 16. viz.* that the grace of God was an adjutory by way of *influence* into *the will. Certum eſt nos ſervare mandata ſi volumus, ſed quia preparatur voluntas a Domino, ab illo petendum eſt, ut tantum velimus, quantum ſufficit ut volendo faciamus. Certum eſt nos velle cum volumus ſed ille facit ut velimus bonum, de quo dictum eſt quod preparatur voluntas a Domino. Its certaine, ſaith he, that when we are willing we will: but he makes us to will good of whom its ſaid, that the will is prepared of the Lord*, But this queſtion is determined *negatively* by *Arminius. Cont. Perkins: Concurſus & influxus Dei, nihil confert creaturæ liberæ quoad agendum, vel inclinetur vel juvetur, vel confortetur. The influx of God conferres nothing to the free creature, to helpe, incline, or ſtrengthen it.* The Schoole of the *Arminians* follow their Maſter, and joyne with *Jeſuits*, making the *grace* of God and *mans will* the *partiall cauſes of mans converſion*, as if two men between them both ſhould beare a burden: thus *Grevinchovius contr. Ameſ.* p. 208. *Gratia & arbitrium concurrunt ut partiales cauſæ ad converſionem hominis, partialitate cauſæ non effectus, eodem planè modo quo pater & filius unam, eandemq; navem trahunt. Grace and free will concurre as partiall cauſes to the converſion of man, with a partiality of the cauſe, not of the effect, as a Father and a Son draw between them both the ſame ſhip, the father not* Jo. Eld. p. 53.

contributing ſtrength to the Son, &c. Such an anſwer as this will make ſhort work, for it leaves no place at all to the *grace of Chriſt*, but reſolves all at laſt into nature; acknowledging no other *influence* from God into the *will*, but that generall *influence* God affordeth unto it, as the author and preſerver thereof. And what elſe doth Maſter *Goodwin* grant us, when he makes all the *influx* that God affords us to be onely by way of *generall concurſe* as we are creatures or men whoſe *natures* are from God, or ſuſtained by God, denying any *ſpeciall influx of Gods grace* into our wils in *converſion*. *Whatſoever* (ſaith Maſter *Goodwin*, p. 11. *To. Eld.*) *is aſcribed unto nature, except nature be given away from God, theres no occaſion given to looke upon it as derogating from the grace of God*; juſt as *Pelagius*, whoſe plea is *recited* and *refuted* by *Aug. Si hominem Deus creavit, & homini Deus liberum donavit arbitrium, quicquid poteſt homo de libero arbitrio, cujus gratiæ debetur niſi ejus qui eum condidit cum libero arbitrio? If God created man, and gave him free will, whatever man doth by his free will, to whoſe grace is this due but to his that made man with free will?* —— *Obſerve (Brethren) how they proclaim the generall grace of God whereby we are men, not whereby we are Chriſtians, &c.*

Aug de verb. *Videte tum fratres mei quomodo generalem illam gratiam prædicant, quâ creatus eſt homo, qua homines ſumus, & utiq; cum impiis homines ſumus, hanc gratiam quâ Chriſtiani ſumus, ipſam volumus prædicent, ipſam volumus agnoſcant.* Fauſt. Regiens. de l. a. l. 2. c. 8. *Qui naturam in bonis ſuis negat prædicari debere, neſcit profecto ipſum naturæ authorem eſſe, qui gratiæ.*

2. You anſwer by taking away the *ſubject of the queſtion*; for I having explained to you what I meant by *grace its concourſe unto the work*, only thus, *as two men that between them both carry a burden, yeeld no aſſiſtance to each other, neither of them contributing ſtrength unto other.* You learnedly anſwer that you muſt deny what the *queſtion* ſuppoſeth, viz. *that faith hath two ends.*

If you had not *confeſſed* your ignorance in this anſwer, yet you had here groſly *bewrayed* it. Who but you would have ſuppoſed *that faith hath two ends*? or that this had been the ſubject of the queſtion? *Alvar. de aux. l. 3. diſp. 18.* would have informed you *better*, where he ſaith, *The queſtion is, utrum neceſſaria ſit prævia dei motio, recepta in ipſa causa, ut de facto producat ſuam operationem, an vero ſufficiat concurſus ſimultaneus pariter influens cum ipſis cauſis in earum effectus. The queſtion is, Whether the motion*

motion of Gods ſpirit be neceſſary, as received into the cauſe it ſelfe, that it may produce its operation, or whether there be required a concourſe beſtowing its influence together with the cauſe upon its effect. Where you may ſee the anſwer in three *concluſions*, the third whereof is againſt *quos dam recentieres theologos*, ſome late Divines (he meanes *Jeſuites and Arminians*) *aſſerentes, quòd concurſus ſupernaturalis non ſit in causam ſed cum cauſa in effectum; Who held that ſupernaturall concourſe was not into the cauſe, but with the cauſe in and upon the effect.* And yet here was no ſuppoſition that grace had two ends.

And did not you ſay, pag. 99. Yo. Eld. *The purging of Jeruſalem was an effect which depended partly upon God and partly upon Jeruſalem, in comporting with God.* And page 100. of Yo. Eld. you ſay in theſe words, *For men actually to will and do things accompanying ſalvation, depends partly upon God in reſpect of the neceſſity of the motion, and aſſiſtance of his ſpirit thereunto, partly upon man in reſpect of a like neceſſity of their concurrence, and conſenting unto the motion of the ſpirit of God.* Did you ſuppoſe when you ſay that the purging of *Jeruſalem* depended partly upon God, and partly upon *Jeruſalem*, that this purging had two ends? and when you ſay that a *mans willing depends partly upon God, in reſpect of motion, and partly upon man in reſpect of a like neceſſity of their concurrence, that faith hath two ends?*

Can there not be a concourſe of two partiall cauſes into an effect, but this *effect* muſt needs have *two ends?* Can you not diſtinguiſh with *Grevinchonius* betweene *partialitas cauſæ & effectus?* May not two cauſes produce one and the *ſame effect*, which yet *partially* concurre as *cauſes* to that *effect?*

In your next ſection you come to the ſecond *quære* that I propounded to you, which was this: *If you do acknowledge that grace is an adjutory unto the will by way of influence into it, whether meane you that this influence is morall, ſuaſory, by way of intreaty, that the will would move, or phyſicall, that is properly, really, and efficaciouſly operative upon it.* Yo. Eld. p. 61. Sect. 70.

This you ſay contains in it more abſurdities than the former; I wiſh your anſwer bewrayed not more *ignorance* and *malice* than your former.

1. You ſay, *It ſuppoſeth that there can be no morall influence,*

but that which is ſuaſory, or by way of intreaty. When Maſter Jenkin *commands his Clerke to ſet a Pſalme, and threatens him, that he will turne him out of his place if he will not do as he is commandeth, hath ſuch an addreſſe any other influence than what is morall, but will Maſter* Jenkin *call it ſuaſory, by way of intreaty?*

Anſw. I pitty you! was there ever a more *ſenceleſſe exception* propounded by one pretending to be an inſtructor? Are you yet to learn what *ſuaſio moralis is?* My acute adverſary conceives, that a *threatning* may be ſaid to have a *morall influence* upon the will, but it cannot be *ſuaſory* or by way of *intreaty*. He will not have *Comminations* or *threatnings* to be *morally ſuaſory*; though you have but a *mite* of your owne, you might have been acquainted with thoſe that have more; but I ſee that (*ſpider*-like) you are only beholding to your owne bowels (and truly you go far enough for your *cob-webs*) otherwiſe you might *have obſerved* in every author who writes about *ſuaſio moralis*, that even threatnings are *ſuaſory*; not to give above one or two inſtances in a caſe ſo *triviall*, ſee *Wendelins*, *Chriſt. Theol. p.* 534. *de ſanctif. mandata, promiſſiones, comminationes ſæpe non perſuadent quod ſuadent.* See alſo *ſuffragium Britan. p.* 135. where you ſhall have theſe words: *Non inficiamur in opere converſionis Deum adhibere Comminationum, promiſſionum, aliarumq; hortationum vim ſuaſoriam.* I pray aſk *Price*, that *puppet incendiary* whats the *Engliſh* of *Comminationes ſuadent*, in the former, and of *Comminationum vim ſuaſoriam* in the latter; (the Latine holding him up, haply he may be kept (though hardly) from ſtumbling into a lye) Learne one leſſon more from a novice, *Though there be difference betweene threatnings and promiſes, yet they are both in their influence upon the will ſuaſory, the latter ab utili, the former ab inutili.*

2. You ſay, That my *quære ſuppoſeth, an inconſiſtency between a morall influence upon the will, and that which is properly, really, and efficaciouſly operative upon it.*

Anſw. Where do I ſay or ſuppoſe that theſe two cannot ſtand together? this indeed I ſay, that a *morall influence* is of it ſelfe *inſufficient*, but not with an *efficatious influence inconſiſtent*, That a *meere morall influence* is *operative* onely *metaphoricõs, & per modum objecti*, and gives no power to the *faculty* upon which it workes, but ſerves onely to *excite* and draw into act the *innate*

power

power, and that the ſoule of man deſtitute of power to *ſupernaturals*, cannot be wrought upon in ſuch an objective way of *morall perſwaſion*.

3. You ſay, That *if by phyſicall influence Maſter* Jenkin *underſtandeth any other kinde of working upon the will by God, than by the mediation of the Word, or than that which is proper to be wrought by ſuch an inſtrument as this, &c. I deny any other phyſicall influence upon the will. It paſſeth my underſtanding to conceive how the will ſhould be wrought or acted into a conſent in any kinde, otherwiſe than by argument, motive, and perſwaſion, unleſſe by force, violence, and compulſion, &c.*

Anſw. Your anſwers here are inconſiſtent 1. with themſelves, and 2. with truth. Firſt you deny any worke of God upon the will, ſave by the *mediation of the Word*, and yet inſtantly you ſay, You *allow an outward excitation of the ſoule*, or *opening of the heart by the ſpirit*, a *gracious and immediate ſupporting of the will in the act of conſenting, &c.* I would faine know how theſe two can ſtand together. Yo. Eld. p. 62.

2. You deny, That *God workes any thing upon the will which is not proper for the Word to worke; or that any thing can be wrought upon the will except by perſwaſion, or by argument, &c.* If you had attended the ſtate of the *queſtion*, you would have ſpared much of this *twatling*; the queſtion is, by what *influence of grace*, the *naturall mans* will is ſet right in *actu primo*, hath a *principle of new life* infuſed into it, and not by what it is made *actually to beleeve*, in *actu ſecundo*, the former is done by the *immediate and almighty power of the grace of God*, the other by the ſame *power working in the word*. You *muſt not aſſert that the cauſa objectiva or moralis* doth create the faculty but ſuppoſe it. For your further information, herein I refer you to that *excellent Tractate* of *Gomarus de gratia converſionis*, particularly to pag. 154. *To.* 1. at whoſe feet you may ſit to reape the bleſſing of his head (as you ſpeak,) but ſit not as an inſtructor any more, but as a novice, not as a teacher, but as teachable.

Homini's tantum iunt habitualis converſionis, præceſſio & antecedens conditio, quod prædicato evangelio reſipiſcentiæ & fidei, deus ſpiritum regenerante virtutem fidei & reſipiſcentiæ animis electorum indat, ut habiles ſint ad parendum Evangelium, actualis verò converſionis ſunt cauſa inſtrumentalis. Gom. p. 154.

4. You tell me (in this ſection) frequently that you *under-*

ſtand not well, it paſſeth *your underſtanding, &c.* to conceive how the will ſhould be acted into conſent, &c. how men be begotten by the Word, &c. The miſte ies of faith are not to be meaſured by the ſtrength of your underſtanding; will you beleeve nothing but what you can conceive? why do you not turne a profeſſed Socinian?

5. You tell me in this Section that *God opens the heart immediately, ſupporteth the will in the act of conſenting*, ſuffers nothing to intervene to prevent conſent. You would faine ſeem to ſay ſomething, but *hoc aliquid nihil eſt*, what meane you by ſupporting of the will? Doth not God as *immediately ſupport* the will when it conſents to *evill*, as in the act of conſenting to *good?* and though he prevents externall tentations, yet leaves he not the will it *ſelf* in *æquilibrio*, to conſent or not to conſent? Is it enough to deliver from *externall tentation*, unleſſe alſo from our owne *internall corruption?* What meane you by *opening the heart?* is it not ſo done by the *Word* that it *paſſeth* (as you ſay) *your underſtanding, how the will ſhould any other way be wrought into a conſent*; meane you not as your *Pelagius*, who in a fit of zeale ſpake for the working of grace juſt as you do; *adjuvat nos Deus per doctrinam & revelationem, &c. God aſſiſteth us by doctrine and revelation, when he opens the eyes of our minds, when he ſhewes us things to come, leſt we ſhou'd be intangled in things preſent, when he diſcovers the ſnares of Satan.* Concerning which and the like paſſages *Auguſtine* ſaith, That *the enemies of grace* (the *Pelagians*) *did never more ſubtilly oppoſe grace, than when they moſt praiſed the Word*; in which reſpect, In Con. mileu. Can. 4. was that *anathema* denounced, * *Quiſquis dixerit, &c. whoſoever ſhall ſay, That the grace of God ſerves to help us againſt ſinne, onely becauſe by that we know and underſtand the commandment, and not alſo becauſe by that grace, power is beſtowed upon us to do what we know, let him be accurſed.*

Aug. de gra. Chr cap. 7. *Adjuvat nos Deus per doctrinam & revelationem ſuam, dum cordis noſtri oculos aperit, dum nobis ne præſentibus occupemur, futura demonſtrat, dum diaboli pandit inſidias, &c. Nunquam iſti inimici gratiæ ad eandem gratiam vehementius oppugnandam occultiores moliuntur inſidias, quàm ubi legem laudant.* * Conc. Mil. c. 4. *Quiſquis dixerit gratiam dei propter hoc tantum nos adjuvare ad non peccandum, quia per ipſam revelatur, & aperitur intelligentia mandatorum, ut ſciamus, &c. non autem per illam nobis præſtari ut quod faciendum cognoverimus, agere valeamus, anathema ſit.*

Yo.Eld.p.63 Laſtly you ſay (in this Section) That *you do not well underſtand what*

what I meane by my phyſicall influence of grace upon the will.

Anſw. Where have you lived all your time? have you grown *grey* in promoting *Arminianiſm*, and yet never heard of the *phyſicall influence?* go to *Ames*, *Triglandius*, *Rivet*, &c. and you ſhall be informed what it is. I acknowledge it with theſe and ſundry other reformed Divines, to be *that gracious and reall working of the Spirit of God, by which a principle of divine life is put into the ſoule of the naturall man, that was dead in ſins and treſpaſſes, by which he is quickned and raiſed from the death of ſinne and of naturall is made ſpirituall, and ſavingly to underſtand and will ſpirituall things.*

You acknowledge *Sect.* 69. that I propounded *foure queries*; *To. Ell. p. 63.* but now in this your 72 *Section*, you having thus ridiculouſly *Sect. 72.* (as is ſeene) gone over my two former quærees, muddily jumble together my two laſt, though not without this *deſigne* of a more *convenient hiding your opinion from the Reader.* My third *quære* was this: *Whether grace be an adjutory uncertaine and reſiſtible, or whether grace be an invincible infallible determinating adjutory to the will.*

1. In this Section you ſay, That I *make the invincibility and infallibility of the working of grace, and the certaine determination of the will by grace, to be one and the ſame; whereas invincibility and infallibility are but modifications of the act or working of grace, and determination of the will, is the act it ſelf, or the effect of ſuch an act.*

The *quære* look't upon will ſhew you a wrangler. Did I ever take it in any other ſence than what your ſelf here ſet downe? namely, That grace is in the manner of working *invincible* and *Bu. Buſh. p. 54.* *infallible*, and therefore *determinating* the will? and make I not both in the quære and throughout my booke, the *certaine determination of the will*, to be the *product* or effect of *grace*, working *infallibly* and *invincibly*; ſhew your *ſeniority* by more *ſeriouſneſſe*.

2. You charge me with ſuppoſing what is not to be ſuppos'd; For *grace* (you ſay) *may invincibly produce ſuch an effect in the ſoule, which anſwers the nature, meaſure, and degree of it, and yet not neceſſarily produce ſuch a certaine determination of the will to a ſaving conſent, or a through act of beleeving.*

It being preſuppos'd, 1. That the *queſtion* is concerning *converting grace*, and not *common*. And 2. That by (*neceſſarily*) is meant *infallibly*. I demand:

1. What

1. What that effect is, which *speciall converting grace* workes in the ſoule, which *anſwers the nature meaſure, and degree of it*, if it be not *a certaine determination of the will.*

2. How this aſſertion of yours will ſtand together with
To Eld. p. 65. that which afterward followes, p. 65. *The grace of God acting in and toward the converſion of a man, ſubdues and takes away all actuall rebelliouſneſſe or gainſayingneſſe of the will, and all inclination toward any rebellion?* Doth it accompliſh all this, and not determine the will?

3. You ſay (in this Section) That *I was ridiculous in demanding whether the certaine determination of the will by grace proceedeth from the powerfull nature of grace, conſidering* (you ſay) *that effects do not proceed from the natures of their cauſes, but from the actuall engagement of their cauſes in a way of efficiency, &c.*

Anſw. But (my acute Antagoniſt) was not I enquiring into the *efficacy of the grace of God as a cauſe* of *converſion* in us? And doth not *every effect* proceed from the nature of the *cauſe?* no, ſay you, but from the *actuall engagement of the cauſe in a way of efficiency*; but this *actuall engagement of the cauſe in a way of efficiency*, is the *nature* of a *cauſe as a cauſe*; we are not conſidering of *the grace of God abſolutely* as it is in *it ſelf*, but *relatively*, as it is *a cauſe* of an effect in *others*. And I demand whether *this effect* do depend upon this *cauſe* infallibly, that whereſoever the cauſe is, by vertue of it the effect ſhall neceſſarily follow.

4. What you ſay concerning the *obtuſeneſſe* of the diſtinction between an infallibility of the working of grace, in reſpect of the event or what *de facto* doth come to paſſe, and in reſpect of the *powerfull nature* of *grace* as the *cauſe*, is not for *want of ignorance*, both becauſe the diſtinction is moſt frequently uſed among the acuteſt that write concerning this controverſie, and alſo in regard that it ſo directly tends to the declaring of that *efficacious cauſality* which is by the *Orthodox* claimed, and by Sectaries denyed to the *grace of God*, there being a vaſt difference betweene an *antecedent adjunct*, the preſence whereof an event doth infallibly follow, and a cauſe properly *productive* of *an effect infallibly* to enſue.

5. To the *maine intent of my quærees* you would be thought to anſwer.

1. You

1. By saying your sense clearly is, *According to the ordinary course of the grace of God, working in and about the conversion of men, there is no man actually converted, but might possibly have acted and demeaned himselfe so, as never to have been thus converted.*

Answ. You pretend to clearnesse, but in your performance I finde nothing lesse. Why use you this expression (*according to the ordinary course of the grace of God*) would you have me beleeve that God hath some other way (*though extraordinary*) by which he can do that which you assert *simply impossible* to be done, as you say it is to make a man *simply impeccable* by the *infallibility of the worke of the grace of God.*

2. You say, That *possibly the grace of God may take away from the will all inclination toward any rebellion, yet it removes not away all possibility to rebell and do wickedly.*

Answ. What you say is nothing to the question; there's no enquiry *whether grace* doth take away *all possibility* in the *will* to *rebell*, but whether it doth not so *infallibly* take away the *act of*, and *inclination to* rebellion, as that the worke of *conversion* alwaies followes this *working* of *grace?*

3. You say, That Master *Jenkin* maketh a *blasphemous claime* to an *incommunicable property of God*, he asserteth himselfe under the same *impossibility* of sinning *with God*; *probatur, he supposeth it impossible for him to sin when he is converted?* Yo. Eld. p. 65.

Though I shall not hope to determine whether ignorance or malice be most prædominant in this charge, yet to the matter of it I easily returne this: A *simple and absolute impossibility* to sin, is one of the *incommunicable properties of God*; but what say you to an *impossibility to sin ex suâ positione*; the *efficacy of grace* supposed, though there be a *naturall defectibility* in the creature, may there not be an *impossibility to sin?* Is it not true, that *good angels and Saints* in heaven cannot *sin?* can they actually put forth their defectibility, so as to frustrate the grace of God, and is it blasphemy to say that they cannot sinne, or in so saying do we grant they have an *incommunicable property of God?*

But 2. O thou my *simple and false accuser*, though you be not tender of charging me with *blasphemy*, yet take heed your selfe of *blaspheming*. I claime no share in the *incommunicable properties* of God, when I averre it impossible for my self or any other to frustrate the councell of God (*for who hath resisted his will*)

or to hinder the worke of *speciall grace* comming to convert; but sadly consider whether you *blaspheme* not, in asserting men to be stronger than God, that they can hinder his worke, when he acteth with that power which is *exceeding great*, and which *raised Christ from the dead?*

4. You say, *A man may sinne after his conversion; therefore much more at any time before.*

Yo. Eld. p. 65. *Answ.* ἀπροσδιόνυσον! If a man be left to himselfe he may sinne; but can he sinne being under that *measure and strength of grace* which is put forth in his conversion, and so as to *overcome* it?

Yo. Eld. p. 65. 5. You say, *If there be a possibility for a man to sinne at any time before his conversion, then is there a possibility in him also to hinder his conversion, because it is impossible for any man to be converted in an act of sinne.*

Answ. From this principle, That it is impossible for a man to be converted in an act of sinne, you may rather argue for the *impossibility* of conversion, than for the *possibility* of *non-conversion*; must a man leave his sinne first, and be *converted afterward?* why cannot God *change the heart*, and *infuse a principle of spirituall life* into a man (as into *Saul*, *Act.* 9.) while he is actually sinning, so that this *conversion* or *passive reception* of a *new life* should be in an act of sinne?

Yo. Eld. p. 66. 6. I having said, *Bn. Bish. pag.* 52. That the efficatious determination of the will by grace, takes nothing away but the pravity and rebellion of it, and restores it to its true liberty; you tell me, *If grace takes nothing away but the rebellion of the will, then it leaves a liberty of rebellion, for there's nothing more evident than that there may remaine a liberty or power of rebellion in the will, when the rebellion it self is taken away.*

There is no question but there may remaine a *power of rebellion*, where there is no *actuall rebellion*, but that this *power* may be brought into *act* when the *act* it self, and *inclination* to it, is taken away, which you grant may be, implyes a *contradiction*. Reconcile these two. *Gods grace subdues all rebellion*, and all inclination to rebell, and yet *rebellion may hinder the worke of Gods grace.*

Yo. Eld. p. 66. 7. You tell me, *If the adjutory of grace restores the true liberty of the will to it, then its that liberty which was naturall to it, wherein*

'twas

'twas created, &c. and then it leaves a liberty in it to rebell and to frustrate the worke *of conversion and defeat it, for the liberty wherein the will was created left the will under a possibility of rebelling.*

Answ. Your arguing discovers that you understand not the nature of the wils true *liberty* which once it had, and to which it is by *grace* restored. The *true liberty* of the will is willingly and freely to obey, to be able to sin is no perfection, nor any part of *true liberty*, but a *defect in the wils liberty.*

I having desired but *one page half fil'd* with quotations out of *Orthodox Writers* agreeing with those your opinions transcribed by the *Subscribers*, you hereupon promise *to give me measure heaped up.* Resolving to make up in *measure* your want in *weight*, and to supply with the *abundancy* of your quotations the defect of their *aptitude* to the matter for which you alleadge them.

1. You snarle at this passage in the *Testimony*, [*thousands of soules which Christ hath ransomed with his blood, shall be endangered to be undone*] *here is* (say you) *the Doctrine of universall redemption asserted, If the ransomed by Christ may perish to eternity, then Christ ransomed not the elect onely, of whose perishing there's not the least possibility.* *Yo. Eld p. 67. Sect. 76.*

Answ. Who but such a spider-like reader would have suckt poyson out of so sweet a floure? may not the Subscribers say to you with *Hicrome* (as I told you even now) *hoc non nobis sed apostolo, lay this accusation at the Apostles doore? Rom.* 14. 15. 1 *Cor.* 8. 11. doth the Apostle meane that any of the *Sheep of Christ could perish, or that any could take them out of the hand of Chtist?* or that any could *perish that are upheld by the power of God through faith*, or that have the *intercession of Christ improved for them, &c. or that are given to Christ by the Father?* Why (if either you could or would not your selfe, have answered for the Apostle or the Ministers) went you not to those reverend and learned Interpreters that have expounded these *Texts*? surely they would have taught you to have given the *Ministers* better usage. *Rom.* 14. 15. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died. *Joh.* 10. 28. *Joh.* 6. 39. *Rom.* 8. 38.

Chrysostome would have informed you, that *those of whom Christ is Redeemer in respect of the sufficiency of the price, may perish, though not those to whom the price is applyed.*

Pareus would have taught you, That *in respect of themselves and left to themselves, the best are in danger of perishing. Hominibus*

Reader, in *Yo. Elder p.* 100. *John Goodwin* alloweth this interpretation *Rom* 14 15. In *Pauls* language saith he he is said to destroy his brother, who doth that which is apt or like to destory him, whether he be actually destroyed or no. *Yo. Eld. Sect.* 77,78,79,80.

nihil infirmius, *In regard of Satans formidable power they might perish*; *In regard of the scandals themselves which (without the powerfull sustentation of God) are insuperable* they might perish, but *in respect of the counsell and decree of God, in respect they are the sheep of Christ, and are sustained with his intercession, they cannot perish.*

Piscator would have told you, That *those who are lookt upon with the judgement of charity, as those for whom Christ dyed, of whom* (he saith) *the Apostle speaks, may perish, though not those for whom certainly Christ dyed.*

You now impudently improve many Sections (though with vaine endeavour) to make three *Reverend learned Ministers* guilty of concurring with you in your *erroneous opinions* concerning *the power of naturall men to good supernaturall.*

These my *Reverend friends* Doctor *Gouge*, Master *Scudder*, Master *Calamy*, (though one so weakly slanderous as your selfe deserved it not) have so far condescended to you as to send me in their severall *vindications* from that unworthy and *hatefull aspersion* of complying with you in your foresaid *opinions*; I shall present them to the Reader distinctly, and *word for word*, as they sent them to me under their *owne hands*.

Doctor *William Gouge* his Vindication.

MAster *John Goodwin* to demonstrate that the substance of his opinion of the power of a naturall man, is contained in the Writings of many of the Subscribers, produceth sundry sentences of theirs: And in particular, having gathered sundry passages out of *The whole Armour of God*, he thus saith in his Νεοσυτοπρεσβ τερος pag. 72. *I appeale to any man that will take the painee to compare my passages with those, whether the one can be Orthodox if the other be erroneous.* Here therefore behold the one compared with the other, each in their owne termes, and thereby judge whether the one be so like the other as is pretended.

The whole Armour of God.	*The Div. Auth. of the Scriptures.*
Page 233. In something or other all those which believe not come short of that which	Pag. 26. Naturall men may do such things, as whereunto God hath by way of promise annexed

The whole Armour of God.

they might have done for attaining unto this precious gift of faith: and that is it for which another day they shall be condemned, unbeliefe is in a mans power.

Page 604. Let every one of what ranke or condition soever he be, be encouraged to apply to himselfe these glad tidings of pardon; and seeing God excludeth none, let not any of us exclude our selves.

Page 591. In the order of Redemption God hath made mans sinne pardonable; but man by his impenitency makes it not to be pardoned.

Page 230. Did not the very lifting up of the Serpent shew, that it was Gods will they should looke on it, and looking be cured? So God causing Christ to be lifted up by preaching of the Gospell before thee, sheweth that HEE WOULD THOU SHOULDEST BELIEVE, and believing have everlasting life.

Page 231. God never failed any that continued to wait on him, at length he satisfied their longing.

Page 289. Though he

The Div. Auth. of the Scriptures.

annexed grace and acceptation.

Page 169. To suppose that they to whom God maketh rich and sweet applications of himselfe, are wholly destitute of all power to do what he requires of them, in this case to save them from destruction, and to confer the great things promised upon them, as *viz.* to believe and repent, is to represent the glorious God in his greatest expressions of mercy and grace, and love unto the world, rather as laughing the world to scorne in that great misery wherein it is plunged, then as a God any wayes truly desirous, or intending to relieve it.

Page 183. They which are without (I meane without the Gospell written or preached upon such termes as it is preached among us daily) have also sufficient meanes (if not large and plentifull) for beleeving.

Page 186. They who are destroyed and perish by the hand of God for unbelief, had meanes, and those sufficient whereby to have beleeved.

Page 182. Concerning those

The whole Armour of God.

hard to the carnall careleſſe man, yet (as *Salomon* ſaith of knowledge *Prov.* 14.6.) faith *is eaſie to him that will* believe, not that it is ſimply in mans power, but that GODS SPIRIT SO OPENETH HIS UNDERSTANDING, &c.

Page 190. If we repaire to the Author who giveth faith, and to the ſpring whence it floweth; if we rightly uſe the right meanes of attaining it, and waite at the doore of wiſdome till hee open unto us, UNDOUBTEDLY WE SHALL FINDE FAITH, and not miſſe of it.

The Div. Auth. of the Scriptures.

have onely the Heavens, the Sun, Moon, and Stars, and the goodneſſe of God in the government of the world, to preach the Goſpell unto them; theſe alſo have reaſon ſufficient (if not in abundance) to thinke the ſame thought, and judge the ſame judgement with the other [who have the Letter of the Goſpell] in the point in hand.

In all the paſſages quoted out of *the whole Armour of God*, there is no ſentence that implyeth, that naturall men may do ſuch things as whereunto God hath by way of promiſe annexed grace and acceptation. Men are there incited to do what lieth in them for attaining grace; but it is not ſaid, that any promiſe of grace is annexed to that which they do, while they remaine in their naturall eſtate.

Neither is it ſaid in any of thoſe paſſages, That none of thoſe to whom God maketh rich and ſweet applications of himſelfe, are wholly deſtitute of all power to believe and repent; for thoſe ſweet applications in the outward diſpenſation of the Word, are made to all preſent, though there may be many reprobates there, who have not power to believe and repent.

Nor yet is it there ſaid, That they who are without the Goſpell

Goſpell have ſufficient meanes for beleeving; nor, That they who periſh for unbeliefe, had meanes ſufficient to have beleeved, if meanes be taken for that power and ability which is in a naturall man.

1 *Object.* If mens *coming ſhort of that which they might have done* be the reaſon of their *condemnation*, it undeniably followes, that they have power to do that whereby their condemnation might be prevented. *Yo. Eld. p. 70.*

Anſw. It doth not follow; becauſe they might more improve their naturall parts than they do, and yet not prevent condemnation thereby, they are ſupernaturall gifts whereby condemnation is prevented.

2 *Object.* In ſaying *unbeliefe is in a mans power*, doth he not imply, that a man hath power over it, and may diſſolve, ſubdue, and deſtroy it, if he will? *Ibid.*

Anſw. No, he implyeth no ſuch thing; he onely intendeth that it ariſeth from a mans ſelfe, and is ordered by a mans own free will, as other corrupt acts are. The evils which are in the Devill, are in his power; yet can he not diſſolve, ſubdue, and deſtroy them. As for the inſtances of originall corruption, blindneſſe by birth, frailty of life, mortality, corruptibleneſſe of fleſh, οὐδὲν πρὸς ἔργον, for none of theſe are acts under the will of man, to be ordered thereby, as unbeliefe is.

3 *Object.* Queſtionleſſe a Teacher would not *incourage* men, or perſwade men to *incourage* themſelves, to do that which he judgeth unpoſſible for them to do. *Ibid. pag. 71.*

Anſw. 1. That which is here taken to be unpoſſible, is brought upon man by his owne default.

2. It is ſuch an impoſſibility as God by the worke of his Spirit can, and ordinarily doth make poſſible. In this reſpect Chriſt ſaith of that which is impoſſible with men, that it is not ſo with God, *Mark* 10.27.

3. The Teacher doth incourage men to go as far as they can, and to do as much as in their power lyeth, to obtaine ſuch or ſuch a bleſſing; which is not to perſwade to that which is impoſſible.

4 *Object.* If *God excludeth none* [from beleeving] then hath he not inflicted any ſuch puniſhment upon men for their ſinne in

in *Adam*, by which they are disabled from believing.

Answ. That which is spoken of Gods *excluding none*, is meant of the manner of dispensing the Gospell, and offering grace, which is with such generall tearmes, as therein no man hath cause to thinke himselfe exsluded. The Author of the *whole Armour of God*, thus explaineth his owne minde, *pag.*603. This Doctrine is to be understood of Gods outward dispensation and manifestation of his mercy by the ministry of the Word, wherein no difference is made betwixt persons, nor exception of any. So as it calleth not into question the secret counsell and eternall decree of God.

SIR,

Master *Scudderr* Vindication.

YOu, with many other Ministers of the Province of *London*, gave testimony against this tenent of Master *John Goodwin*, *viz.* touching *Naturall mans free will and power to good supernaturall*; He asserteth, That *by improvement of nature a man may attaine to such a conviction, as upon which saving conversion alwayes follows*: This I judge to be an errour. For the Apostle saith, *The naturall man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are*

1 *Cor.*2.14.

*Rom.*8.5,7,8.

foolishnesse unto him: Neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned. And he saith also, *They that are after the flesh* (as all naturall men are) *savour or minde the things of the flesh.* And againe, *The carnall minde is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the Law of God, nor indeed can be. So that they that are in the flesh cannot please God.* Wherefore man by no naturall power can improve the gifts of nature so, as without speciall grace to will or do that which is spirituall and supernaturall, as to repent, believe, &c.

*Christians daily walk, cap.*15. *sect.* 1. *page* 452,453.

I finde that Master *John Goodwin* hath alleadged some passages in my booke, as if I did concurre with him, or favour his opinion. I have hereupon considered and weighed well what I have there written, and finde nothing tending to the maintenance of his errour; but something expresly against free will to good. I declaring, That notwithstanding Christ may be said to give himselfe a ransome for all, &c. yet this doth not argue universall Redemption, nor that all men may be saved if they will. I appeale to any judicious and impartiall

Reader,

Reader, whether in any thing I have there written, I have juſtified his opinion; which I am utterly againſt.

Henry Scudder.

SIR,

UNde ſtanding of your purpoſe to returne an anſwer to Maſter *John Goodwins* booke, and finding that therein I am brought upon the ſtage as one that, in a Sermon preached *Jan.* 12. 1644. ſhould ſay ſomething to countenance that heterodox opinion of his, *That a naturall man hath power to believe and repent.* I thought it my duty, ſo far at leaſt to vindicate my ſelfe and my Miniſtry, as to intreate you to inſert in your Anſwer thus much as from me, by way of reply. Maſter *Calamy* his Vindication.

1. That I do and alwaies did abhorre that *proud*, *Pelagian*, and *Arminian* Tenent. And that 1. becauſe it ſeemes to me, as it is defended by him in his booke, to ſet up *free will*, (which by the fall of *Adam* is no longer *liberum* but *ſervum arbitrium*) in the place of *free grace*. And to make *free will* to put the *difference* betweene the *Elect* and the *Reprobate*, and not *free grace*, which is contrary to *Rom.* 9. 11, 18. *Eph.* 1. 5, 11. 1 *Tit.* 1. 9.

2. Becauſe it makes a man able by nature to do ſomething that will *poſitively* and *infallibly diſpoſe* and *prepare* him to *converſion*, which is contrary to *Rom.* 11. 35. *John* 15. 5. *John* 6. 44. And contrary to right reaſon alſo, as * *Voſſius* excellently ſheweth.

* *Nihil ſe diſponit ad gradum aliorem quam habet natura. Atqui gratia regenerans excedit totam naturam, quicquid igitur eſt à viribus naturæ id inferioris eſt ordinis & improportionatum ad gratiam. Poteſt quidem homo minus peccando, minus indiſpoſitus reddi ad recipiendam gratiam, quam alius ſed nihil tamen facere poteſt, per quod ad gratiam diſponatur. Voſſi hiſtoria Pelagiana lib. 4. part. 1. & pag. 420. pag. 419. Diſpoſitio ad gratiam eſt pars converſionis noſtræ: Converſio autem eſt opus Divinum,* Pſal. 85. 5. Lam. 5. 21.

3. Becauſe his opinion, as he defends it, ſeems to me wholly to take away the *neceſſity* of *preventing grace*, and to make the grace of *converſion* to be *ſubſequent* onely to mans naturall endeavours, or at leaſt but *concomitant*. Which is contrary to *Iſa.* 65. 5. *Rom.* 9. 16.

4. Becauſe the Scripture ſets out the *ἀδυναμία* and *inability* of a naturall man to beleeve, and repent in ſuch *full* and *expreſſe*

termes, as that (as I conceive) it is impossible to be my opinion without wresting the Scriptures. Witnesse *Gen.* 6. 5. *Gen* 8. 21. *Jer.* 17. 9. *Eccl.* 36. 26. *Mat.* 7. 18. *John* 5. 25. *Rom* 8. 7. *Rom.* 5. 6, 10. 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. 2 *Cor.* 3. 5. *Ephes.* 2. 1, 2, 3, *Col.* 2. 13. *John* 3. 6. and divers others of the like nature. The Scripture doth not onely say, That a man by nature is *in the darke*, (as Master *G.* erroneously affirmes) but that he is *darknesse*, *Eph.* 5. 8. not onely that he *wants light*, but that he *wants eyes also*, *Deut.* 29. 4. Not onely that he is *dead in sinnes*, in regard of the *guilt of sinne*, (as Master *G.* saith) but also in regard of all spirituall ability to raise himselfe, as appeareth by the next argument.

5. Because conversion in Scripture is not onely said to be a *giving of light to one that hath eyes before* (as Master *G.* saith) but a *giving of sight also*, Isa. 42. 7. *Lu.* 4. 18. It is not onely a *giving an immediate actuall or present capacity* (as Mr. *G.* minceth it contrary to Scripture) but it is a *putting* within us a *principle of spirituall life*. It is not onely a *raising us up from the guilt of sinne*, but it is a bestowing upon us a *new heart*, and *a new Spirit*, it is a *spirituall resurrection* and *regeneration*, 1 Pet. 1. 23. *Ja.* 1. 18. John 3. 3. Ezek. 36. 26. And therefore as a naturall man cannot contribute any thing to his *naturall being*, no more can he contribute any thing properly to his *supernaturall being*.

These and divers other reasons have induced me alwaies since I knew what belonged to Divinity, to detest and abhorre this his unsound and unjustifiable opinion.

There is a second thing that I would have you likewise to put into your Answer.

Secondly, That I am much wronged and abused in what Master *G.* relates concerning the Sermon I preached *Jan.* 12. 1644. The truth is, looking over my notes, I finde that I made two Sermons upon the Doctrine mentioned in the Booke. In which I laid downe this position quite contrary to his assertion, *That man by nature is dead in sin and trespasses, unable to do any thing that is spiritually good, as he ought to do.* That man *by nature is unable to believe and repent, and is like the cold earth, able of it selfe to bring forth briers and thornes, but not able to do any thing pleasing to God, in order to eternall life, unlesse he be enabled by the seed of grace sowen in his heart by Gods holy Spirit.* Indeed I added,

That

That a man *unconverted*, remaining *unconverted*, might do that *that was right in the ſight of the Lord*, he might do *bonum* though not *bene*. And by the helpe of the *Holy Ghoſt* in the common worke of it, he might do *many things in order to ſalvation*. And that the reaſon why he is damned, is not for *want of power*, but for not *improving the power he hath*; not for *cannot*, but *will not*.

But then I ſubjoyned two other poſitions.

1. That no unconverted man *did ever improve the power that God hath given him*, but doth give *advantage* to *God* to *damne* him for *voluntary refuſing* to do what he hath power to do.

2. That though an *unconverted man* did *improve his naturall abilities* to the utmoſt of his power, yet notwithſtanding *God was not bound by any promiſe to beſtow the grace of converſion upon him*. This I proved by five arguments too long here to repeat.

And thus I have given you a ſhort account of what concerns me in his Booke. I have but a word more to ſay; and that is to a paſſage in the 131 page, in which he ſaith, *He will not ſo far abuſe me, as to call me either learned or pious*. For my part, I thanke God I am not ſolicitous what he or his Pulpit-Incendiary ſay of me. I have learned of my great Maſter to requite *good* for *evill*, and to *heape coales of fire upon their heads*, which I deſire may be in *remedium*, not in *ruinam*. The great God guide us all into the wayes of peace, truth and holineſſe. So prayeth

Your loving Brother in the worke of the Miniſtry.

EDM. CALAMY.

What a vaſt Ocean of ſcorns, jeers, vilifyings, *childiſh ventoſities*, and prophane *puffs of wit* do I ſayle through, before I can eſpy the leaſt point or ſpot of land, any thing wherein he ſo much as pretends to *theologicall argumentation?* ſollid matter lodgeth in his *great booke* of *words*, as a childe of two dayes old in the *great bed of Ware*. Going over many pages fill'd with nothing but with *ſcum* and *ſcurrility*, he vents, among hundreds of other ſuch unſavoury paſſages, this gentle expreſſion:

Sect. 90. *Confident I am, that there never was a generation of* 2e. Eld. p. 85. Sect 90.

Christians (scarce of men) so bloody in asserting their opinions, &c. as the greatest part of the London *Subscripturients.*

I marvaile not at your *confidence, Solomon* tels me who it is that *rageth and is confident*, Prov. 14. 16.

For the *bloody asserting, &c.* never were the veines of any writings so fill'd with the blood which you speake of, as those of this last and worst of your pamphlets; certainly when you wrote it, you were under a *quotidian fury*, or sick of the *miserere mei*; the Reader beholds you vomiting your excrements of scurrility and wrath in every page; what is there that you mention through your booke (if you would have it help you) but either you *feigne* it your *friend*, or else you *frowne* upon it, that it may not dare to be your enemy, the *Scriptures*, *the Fathers*, *your mother Tongue*, *your opposites*, against their bent and mindes, are *threatned* unlesse they stoop to your *fence* and *service*; Scriptures must speake for *you* against *themselves*, and *Urijah-like* must carry *letters* for their owne *destruction*; *Bucer*, *Ball*, the *Fathers*, under the paine of self-*contradiction*, and of being *accounted naked and unstable, must turn Pelagians.*

To. Ell. p. 5. p. 76-9.

If you will have it so, it must be *fence* for the *garment* to be clothed with the *man*, and it must be as proper to say, *exchange* this thing *into* another, as to say *exchange* it *for* another thing. Who ever will lift up a pen against you, must expect no other *guerdon*, but to have your pen cased in his heart, and to lye *bleeding* at *the feet of your writings*; the pulling downe of *Sion Colledge* shall be voted *the taking away of the pillar of all impiety and opposition to the truth*; all the workes that ever stood it out against you must be demolisht and *dismantled*: Your *next wrath* is expected against those *daring* (and yet more *knowing* than *daring*) men, who have priz'd your works that now lye upon the hands of your late *booksellers* widow, but for *wast paper*; which by the way I note as a *just retribution* of providence, that those writings which value the Scriptures below *the Word of God*, should *themselves* be *valued below the word of man.*

Sect. 91. p. 85.

You *recite* an *argument* which you brought in *Sion Coll. visited*, to prove that *naturall men have eyes to see spirituall things. Naturall men* (say you) *have eyes to see because it is not needlesse for Satan to blinde them.*

I de-

I deny'd your consequence, and gave you the ground of that my *denyall*, *viz.* because the *Scripture* saith, 1 Cor. 2. 14. *The naturall man cannot know the things of the Spirit of God.*

After your scoffs (which I answer with neglect) you returne thus:

1. You say, That by φυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος *the naturall man* is not meant the man that is *simply naturall or unregenerate, but such a kinde of men whom the Apostle cals carnall, babes in Christ, meaning weake Christians.* Confidently concluding from my producing of this Scripture for this purpose, I understand little of it.

Answ. I had rather suspect any interpretation of Scripture, when you say 'tis *true* and *sound*, than when you say 'tis false and *misunderstood.*

You have the streame of godly and learned Interpreters against you. *Piscator* takes this *naturall man* for a man that *Nihil eximium in se habet præter animam rationalem, qui non est regenitus*; a *man that hath nothing excellent but a rationall soule, and is not borne againe, Ans.* saith, this *naturall man is* one *Qui animalium more versatur, qui putat nihil esse post mortem, one that lives like a brute creature, and thinks there's nothing more after death to be expected. Ambrose* thus: *Animalis homo pecoribus similis, &c.* This *naturall man like the beasts, keeps downe his sence to the earth, and therefore he only reacheth what he sees, nor thinketh he that any thing can be, but as he heares; therefore whatever he heares to be otherwise, he judgeth it foolish. Theophilact* saith, This *naturall man* is one that is *given altogether to naturall reasonings thinking not that he wants succour from above.*

Ambr. in Loc. *Sensum in terram deprimit, ideoque non assequitur nisi quæ videt, nec putat aliquid posse fieri quam quomodo scit, ideo quicquid aliter audit quam norit, stultum judicat.*

Oecumenius thus: *The naturall man is one that lives after the flesh, and hath not his understanding enlightned by the Spirit.*

Theophilact. ὁ τὸ πᾶν τοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς λογοισμοῖς εἰδὼς, καὶ μὴ νομίζων δεῖσθαι τῆς ἄνωθεν βοηθείας.
Oecumen ὁ κατὰ σάρκα ζῶν, καὶ μηπω τὸν νοῦν φωτίσθεις διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος.

Theodoret thus: *Qui Contentus propriis Cogitationibus, spiritus doctrinam non admittit, One that is pleased with his owne cogitations and gives no admittance to the Doctrine of the Spirit.*

Calv. in Loc. *Hominem animalem vocat quemlibet hominem solis naturæ facultatibus prælitum in puris naturalibus relictum. Per spiritualem intelligitur is cujus mens illuminatione spiritus Dei regitur.*

Calvin saith, By the *Naturall man is meant a man endowed onely*

with the faculties of nature, and by the ſpirituall, a man whoſe minde is governed by the illumination of the Spirit.

I ſhall make bold to inſtruct my inſtructor out of *Iſidorus Peluſiota, Ep. l. 5. Ep.* 128. Σαρκικὸς καλεῖ ἡ γραφὴ τοὺς ἀτελεῖς τῆς σαρκὸς &c. The Scripture diſtinguiſheth (as he ſhews) between the σαρκικοὶ, the ψυχικοὶ, & πνεῦμα ἔχοι. The *Carnall*, the *naturall*, and the *ſpirituall*. The *Carnall* that fall, by reaſon of their weakneſſe, into many wayes that are fleſhly. *Naturall*, that follow the reaſoning of the naturall minde and underſtanding. The *ſpirituall* that are adorned with the gift of the holy Ghoſt, and are illuminated above nature, as (he divinely expreſſeth it) τὰς φύσει φαντζομένας, λογισμοὺς ἀνελόντες ἀϊδίους ἀναδεικνύντες, having gotten above naturall reaſonings.

Diſp. 11. *Theſ.* 8. I ſtay in *Arminius*, who ſaith, *Mens hominis (non renati) in iſto ſtatu Cæca eſt, ſalutari Dei, ejuſq; voluntatis cognitione deſtituta, nec capax illorum, quæ ſunt ſpiritus Dei, juxta Apoſtolum, Animalis homo, &c. The minde of an unregenerate man* (ſaith he) *is blinde and deſtitute of the ſaving knowledge of God and of his will, not able to receive the things of the Spirit of God, according to the Apoſtle, The naturall man, &c.* I add, the ſame kind of men are ſpoken of by *Iude*, The *Apoſtle*, *verſ.* 19. *he joyning* ψυχικοὶ, & τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες, *Seperatiſts ſenſuall or naturall, not having the Spirit, together.* So *James* joynes naturall and devilliſh together, the 3. cap. 15. ver. *The wiſdome that is not from above is ſenſuall or naturall* ψυχικὴ *and devilliſh*, ſo that the naturall man, 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. is unregenerate.

2. You ſay, *That by naturall man, is meant a weake beleever, becauſe* by *naturall* here, and *carnall cap.* 3. 1. 3. are meant the ſame men. Now by *carnall* there is meant the *weak beleever.*

Anſw. Its evident that the *carnall man* ſpoken of, *cap.* 3. 1. and the *naturall man* ſpoken of in *cap.* 2. 14. are not the ſame. That *carnall man* was a *babe* in *Chriſt*, and therefore he was ſuch an one as *had the Spirit of Chriſt dwelling in him*, Rom. 8. 9. This *naturall man* was ſuch an one as *had not received the Spirit*, ver. 12. 14.

3. You endeavour to prove that by *carnall man*, *cap.* 3. 1. and by *naturall man*, c. 2. 15. are *meant the ſame*,

Becauſe the ſame kinde of perſons whom he cals *ſpirituall is oppoſed both the naturall man*, c. 2. 15. *and to the carnall*, c. 3. 1.

Anſw. Away with this *trifling*; a *man* may be oppoſed to a

beaſt

beast and a *childe*, therefore a *beast and a childe are the same*; *dicite Jo. Paan*, *cap* 2.15. *the spirituall and naturall man* differ *status*, as a *man* that *hath the spirit* from him that *hath it not*; but c. 3. 1. the *spirituall man* and the *carnall* differ *onely gradu*, in *degree and measure of participation of the same spirit, as you your self assert.*

4. You say, That *the Apostle doth not speake simply or in generall of the things of God, nor particularly of things simply necessary to be beleeved to salvation, but onely of the deep things of God, which things*, v. 6. *he had called wisdome.*

Answ. The contrary is evident by the *context* that the *Apostle* speakes *generally* of the *things of the Gospell, Christ crucified*, c. 1. 24. made to us of God, *wisdome, &c.* c. 1. 30. &c. of the *wisdome of God*, c. 2. 7. as opposed to the *wisdome of this world*, v. 6. *the manifold wisdome of God made known by the Church*, Ep. 3. 10. All the *Gospell* is a *great mystery*, 1 Tim. 3. 16. *A mystery kept secret.* Rom. 16. 25. *Into which the Angels desire to looke*, 1 P. 1. 12. Though in this *mystery* there be greater and lesser *deeps*, yet all *are deeps*, so *deep* as that *none of the princes of this world did know them, by the spirit we coming to know the things that are given us by God. Chrysost.* by the wisdome you speake of, which the Apostle preacht to those that were perfect, understands *it of the preaching of life and salvation by the death of Christ*, and by the *perfect ones* beleevers, *&c.* And *Calvin* upon the place saith, That *by perfect ones the Apostle understands not those that had atteyned to high degree of knowledge, but those that were of a sound judgement.*

1 *Cor.* 2. 8. Chrys. in Loc. Σοφίαν λέγει τὸ κήρυγμα καὶ τὸν ὅρον τῆς εὐσεβείας τὸ διὰ σταυροῦ σωθῆναι. τελείους δὲ τοὺς πνευματικούς.

Perfectos vocat non qui assequuti sunt plenam sapientiam, sed qui sano sunt & incorrupto judicio Calv. in Loc.

5. You say, That man *meerly naturall* may be *uncapable of these, and yet be apprehensive of such of the things of God, the knowledge whereof is of absolute necessity to salvation, as Generally of the duties commanded in the Morall Law, of the eternall power and Godhead manifested in the creation, &c.*

Answ. The things of the *Law*, or of the *eternall power* and *Godhead*, are not the things of which the *Apostle* is speaking, or which you and I are disputing of. The things we are now speaking of, are the *things freely given us to our glory*; for those other, which you say *naturall men* are apprehensive of, duties of the Morall Law which are absolutely *necessary to salvation*, &c. if you say they are *absolutely necessary to salvation*, I yeeld it, as *sine quibus non est salus*, but not as *Cum quibus est salus*; by the way, lee

let the Reader but consider this *arch-argumentator*, who from this his exposition, That *weak Christians* are not *capable of the deep things of God*, undertakes to prove that the *naturall man* may understand those things which are *necessary to salvation.*

Pag. 88. Se. 94. In your 94. Section you say, *That power which the Apostle here denyes to his naturall man, of knowing the things of God, may well nay of necessity must be understood onely of an immediate, actuall, or present capacity of power, so that his meaning may be onely this: The naturall man, while he continues meerly such, hath no principle or power actually and* de præsenti *to know savingly the things of the Spirit of God; but this proveth not but that a naturall man may have such principles, even for the present, which by a regular improvement, and such, whereof by the never denyed assistance of God at first, he is very capable, may advance and rise through the ordinary blessing of God in such cases, into such a capacity or power as is contended for; a youth of twelve yeares of age cannot construe a Chapter in the Hebrew Bible, he hath no immediate actuall power, yet such a power he hath, by the improvement whereof he will according to the ordinary course of Gods providence be able to do it, &c.*

Answ. Why do you so *flagg* and *faulter* in giving us the meaning of the *Apostles* saying, This power *may* well be understood, &c. the meaning *may* onely be this, &c. Did your heart misgive you? take heed; uncertainty, I feare, is your punishment, though you pretend confidence.

2. That the *naturall* man hath no *power to know savingly the things of the Spirit of God*, I acknowledge for an undeniable truth.

3. When you say, *Nevertheless this proveth not but such a man may have such principles by a regular improvement, &c.* I told you before of your *foggy conceptus*; you might have spoken your self a *Pelagian*, as plainly as now you do, with halt these words.

1. These *principles* you speake of, by the improvement whereof he may rise to the *power contended* for, I suppose are those which you mention *Divine Auth.* pag. 200. *reason, judgement, understanding, memory, &c.* if you meane not these *let me heare.*

2. By the *never denyed assistance of God*, whereby a man is capable of *improvement* &c. at first. If you meane not *a generall*

concourse

concourſe of God, afforded and given to every man as a man, and as *created of God*, according to that *paſſage*, Yo. Eld. p. 11. *Where you told us, becauſe nature is not given away from God, whatever is aſcribed unto nature, is no derogating from the grace of God*, cleare your ſelfe.

3. By *advancing into ſuch a power* as is *contended for*, you muſt underſtand a power of *knowing ſavingly*, and *beleeving the things of the Spirit of God*. The *ſumme* of all which is thus much: *A naturall man, by the ordinary aſſiſtance and bleſſing of God, afforded to every one, may ſo improve his naturall Principles of Reaſon, Judgement, Memory, &c. as ſavingly to know and believe the things of God.*

This your ſimilitude of a youth that may by paines acquire skill in the tongues further declareth to be your meaning, by which wretched opinion you hold out, That *there's nothing in grace above nature*, which *nature may not reach unto*; or rather, That grace it ſelfe is nothing but *poliſht nature*. But how ſtands this with the words of the *Apoſtle*, who ſaith, That the *naturall* man *cannot know the things of God, becauſe they are* ſpiritually *diſcerned*, and elſewhere, That the *carnall minde cannot be ſubject to the Law of God*, as being enmity *againſt God*. Can all the paines, improvement, polliſhing, make nature any other than nature, and make a naturall man to underſtand or believe any thing but after a naturall manner? can it give ability to know ſpiritually? can all the care, and coſt, and dreſſing, make a *bad tree* to be of a *good kinde*, and while bad, to bring forth *good fruit?*

I adde in explication of this of the *Corinthians*, 1 *Cor.* 2. 14. and for your information; that excellent paſſage of learned *Muſculus* upon the place, *Confert. utrinq; tam hominem, &c.*

Muſc. in Loc.

The Apoſtle compareth the naturall man (ſaith he) *and the Spirit of God, and he teacheth, That the naturall man cannot know the things of the Spirit, any more than a beaſt the things of a man, &c.*

Confert. utrinq; tum hominem animalem tum ſpiritum dei, & docet ita eſſe comparatum hominem animalem, ut quæ ſpiritus Dei ſunt nequeat cognoſcere, quemadmodum ſi dicas beſtiam cognoſcere non poſſe quæ hominum ſunt plus intereſt inter animalem hominem, & ſpiritum Dei, deinde & inter intellectum hominis, & ea quæ ſunt Dei, quam inter hominem & beſtiam.

In your 95. Section you produce a double conſtruction of the *S.* Yo. Eld. p. 89. *S.* 95.

the Apoſtles words, 1 *Cor.*2.14. *The naturall man cannot know the things of the Spirit, &c. This unability* (yon ſay) *may either be underſtood of the great difficultie that lyes in the way of ſuch men; to attayne the knowledge of theſe things, or elſe of their preſent, actuall indiſpoſednesſe to ſteere a courſe to render them capable of ſuch knowledge.*

Anſw. I meet in theſe ſections with a *ſea* of words, and a *drop* of matter, you multiply expreſſions to no purpoſe.

1. If you ſay, The *naturall man* is *unable* in the former ſence, becauſe of the *difficulty* that lyeth in his way, &c. you are a *meere Pelagian*, and that by your owne *cleare confeſſion*; which is in theſe very words: The *maine difference* between Auſtin *and* Pelagius, *was, whether the adjutory of grace was ſimply and abſolutely neceſſary, for the enabling to do that which is good, &c. which was* Auſtins *opinion*; or, *Whether it was neceſſary onely by way of accommodation and facilitation for ſuch a performance*; *which was the ſence of* Pelagius. And if this be your opinion with *Pelagius*, why bring you the Fathers particularly *Auſtin*, as joyning with you in the point of the adjutory of grace, in *Sion Coll. viſited?* when as, by your owne confeſſion, *Auſtin* was againſt you and your *facilitating adjutory*. I ſhall adde you were *condemned* for holding this opinion long before you were borne.

Yo. Eld. p. 51. 52.

Quicunq; dixerit ideo nobis gratiam dari, ut, quod facere, jubemur per liberum arbitrium, facilius poſſimus implere per gratiam, ta quam & ſi gratia non daretur, non quidem facile, ſed tamen poſſimus ſi eâ illâ implere divina mandata, Anathema ſit. De fructibus enim mandatorum loquebatur dominus, ubi non ait ſine me difficilius poteſtis facere, ſed ait ſine me nihil poteſtis facere. Conc. Afr. Can cap. 5.

2. If the latter be your opinion, viz. *That naturall men are unable, onely in regard of their preſent and actuall indiſpoſednesſe and averſenesſe, &c.* Beſides that I have confuted it before; it is evidently contrary to thoſe Texts of Scripture impudently and impertinently cited by your ſelf for your ſelf. as *Matt.* 12. 24 *How* **can** *ye being evill ſpeak good things*, Joh. 5. 44. *How* **can** *yee believe, &c. Joh* 6.44. *No man* **can come** *to me, unleſſe the Father draw him, &c.* Jo.12.39. *Therefore they* **could** *not believe, &c.* Joh. 15. *Without me ye can do nothing*, and 1 Joh. 14. 17. *The Spirit of truth which the world* **cannot** *receive, &c.* Rom.8.8. *They that are in the fleſh* **cannot** *pleaſe God*, (to which you might as well have added, had it not oppos'd you a little too palpably) Rom.8.7. *The carnall minde is enmity againſt God, for it is not ſubject to the Law of God, neither indeed* **can** *be.* Theſe Scriptures clearely teaching

ing that though man have a ſoul *paſſively capeable* of ſaving grace, faith, knowledge, repentance, &c. and his want of them be indeed accompanied with preſent hatred and contempt of them, yet that he is alſo *abſolutely* unable to attaine them, and that it is poſſible *onely* to God to worke them in him; nor do you in alledging theſe Scriptures, forme an argument out of them, to prove that this want of power is onely in regard of actuall indiſpoſedneſſe. Sure I am, you might have rais'd ſeverall arguments againſt that your curſed and rotten Expoſition; as, That its an impotency conſiſting in the want of a ſpirituall *principle* and *faculty* ſuitable to the duties and performances which men are ſaid to be unable to do, *with out* me *ye can do* nothing, 1 Cor. 2 14. *The* naturall *man cannot know the things of God, for they are* ſpiritually *diſcerned*, Mat. 7. 18. a corrupt tree *cannot bring forth* good *fruit*, Mat. 12. 34. how can ye being evill ſpeake good things, *Rom.* 8. 8. They that are in the fleſh cannot pleaſe God; and as the naturall mans *impotency* proceeds from the defect of a *ſpirituall principle*, ſo for the removall of that impotency, God beſtoweth a new principle of ſpirituall life, (which were needleſſe if mans impotency proceeded onely from actuall indiſpoſedneſſe) *Ezek.* 36. 26. *A new heart will I give you and a new ſpirit will I put into you*, and *I will give you a heart of fleſh*. And that its not an impotency that proceeds onely from actuall indiſpoſedneſſe or unwillingneſſe, is cleare in that *a naturall man cannot* but be indiſpoſed, and *unwilling* to every ſpirituall act; to *believe and repent, &c. No man can* Joh. 6. 44. come *to me except the Father draw him*; No man can be willing Joh. 14. 17. or conſent, unleſſe the Father make him ſo; the world cannot receive the ſpirit. The like alſo is evident from, Rom. 8. 7. *The carnall minde is* enmity *againſt God, and* cannot *be ſubject to the Law of God, &c.* Joh. 15. 5.

Theſe are the principall paſſages which I finde in his Booke, wherein he pretends either to Scripture or Argument; for indeed the buſineſſe of argumentation, is but the by-worke of this his big work.) The bulk of his booke, being a heap of *defamations and ſcurrilities*, fitter for a ſinke than a ſtudy, concerning which, I ſay, 'twere eaſie to returne him *reviling for reviling*; but this were to lay aſide the Miniſter, the Chriſtian,

now

nay the man; and as ridiculous as for a man whom an asse hath kickt, to kick the asse again. I shal couclude mine (*mutatis mutandis*) as M. *Goodwin* began his: Though more truly. *For a great part of Mr.* Goodwin *his pamphlet, the constitution and complexion of it,* Ye. Eld. p. 1. *easeth me of the labour of making any answer or reply unto it; for consisting of such reproaches, vilifications, and disparagements (the madnesse whereof is sufficiently knowne unto and cryed out against by all men) I should but actum agere, and do that which is abundantly done already to my hand, if I should go about to possesse men of sobriety and judgement, with the unsavourinesse thereof.*

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAg. 5. Marg. read Ac. 1. 25. p. 2. l. ult. for streames read steames; p. 13. l. 35. r. pore, than himself, p. 14. l. 25. instead of for, r. only o amaze. p 17 l. 2. r. their, l. 3 r. not, p. 26. l. 25. r. neaver, p. 31. m. r. Cc. de Scar. d 36. m. l. 15. r divinarum, p. 37 l. 15. r. was p. 40 l. penult, r place, what followes, p. 41. l. 32 r. lumimus, p. 43. m r. conscript. p. 47. l 32. r. tradita, p. 58. l. r. revealed, p. 77. m. r. hominis, p. 77. m. r. efficacissimo p. 80, m r. concupiscentem, p. 81. l. 11. r. illum, p. 85. m. r. qua semper mala, ib. l. arbitrium, p. 86. l. 25. l. scriptures, p. 87. l. 14. r. makes p. 88. l. 25. r. undervalewing, ib. in m. r. ut p. 89. m. l. perpetrando. p. 94. l. 34. r. and, l. penult, del you, p. 95. l. 9. r. causality, p. 93. l. 5. dele of, p. 117. l. 30. r. λογισμοῖς.